
SHOUT
SHARE
IT

ZS 2702

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

VOLUME 41

LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publication Office, c/o British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD
1984

(All rights reserved)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology	1
Special Announcements	2
Contacts with representative organisations; R. V. Melville	3
Cardium californiense Deshayes, 1839 (Mollusca, Cardiidae). D. Heppell & R. V. Melville	5
Opinion 1264. *Oscinis plumigera* Loew, 1860 (Insecta, Diptera)	8
Opinion 1265. *Bellota* Peckham & Peckham, 1892 (Araneae, Salticidae)	10
Opinion 1266. *Cophixalus* Boettger, 1892 (Amphibia, Salientia)	12
Opinion 1267. *Muscicapa ruficauda* Swainson, 1838 (Aves, Muscicapidae)	15
Opinion 1268. *Simia leucophaea* F. Cuvier, 1807 (Mammalia, Primates)	17
Opinion 1269. METRIDIIDAE Carlgren, 1893 (Anthozoa) and METRIDIIDAE Sars, 1902 (Copepoda)	19
Opinion 1270. *Chrysomela flavicornis* and *C. tibialis* Suffrian, 1851 (Insecta, Coleoptera)	22
Opinion 1271. *Polynoe* Savigny, 1818 (Annelida, Polychaeta)	24
Opinion 1272. *Sciaena nibe* Jordan & Thompson, 1911 (Pisces)	26
Opinion 1273. *Anaspis, Luperus, Lampyris* and *Clerus* (Insecta, Coleoptera)	28
Opinion 1274. *Notonecta striata* Linnaeus, 1758 (Insecta, Hemiptera)	32
Opinion 1275. *Macrocephalites* Zittel, 1884 and *Ammonites macrocephalus* Schlotheim, 1813 (Mollusca, Cephalopoda)	34
Opinion 1276. *Semblis marginata* Panzer, 1799 (Insecta, Plecoptera)	36
Direction 114. Herrera, 1899, 'Sinonimía vulgar y científica de los principales vertebrados mexicanos'	39
Direction 115. MEROPIDAE (Aves): attributed to Rafinesque, 1815.	41
Heliconius erato Aurivillius, 1882 (Insecta, Lepidoptera). J. R. G. Turner	43
Curculio picirostris Fabricius, 1787 and *Tychius stephensi* Schönherr, 1836 (Coleoptera, Curculionidae). W. E. Clark	45
Dapsilarthra Foerster, 1862 (Insecta, Hymenoptera). C. van Achterberg	53
Adianthus bucatus Ameghino, 1891 (Mammalia). R. L. Cifelli & M. F. Soria	56
Status of the names *Callionymus sagitta* Pallas, 1770 and *Callionymus filamentosus* Valenciennes, 1837 (Teleostei, Callionymidae). R. Fricke	58
Proposed conservation of *Siphonosoma cumanense* Keferstein, 1867 over *Siphonosoma edule* (Pallas, 1774) (Sipuncula). E. B. Cutler	62
Pellonula bahiensis Steindachner, 1879 (Pisces). P. J. P. Whitehead & G. Nelson	65
Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology	67
Special Announcements	69
On the proposals concerning *Astacilla* Cordiner, 1793. L. B. Holthuis	72
On the proposed conservation of *Crinodes* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855 and *Pero* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855. J. D. Holloway	72
Zygaena anthyllidis Boisduval, [1828] (Insecta, Lepidoptera). C. M. Naumann & W. G. Tremewan	73

Reptomultisparsa d'Orbigny, 1853 (Bryozoa, Cyclostomata). P. D. Taylor 77
GOERIDAE Ulmer, 1903 versus TRICHOSTOMATIDAE Rambur, 1842 (Insecta, Trichoptera). The Secretary 80
Atractocera latipes Meigen, 1804 (Insecta, Diptera, Simuliidae). I. A. Rubtsov, with comment by R. W. Crosskey 83
Choeropsis Leidy, 1852 (Artiodactyla). R. M. Schoch & S. G. Lucas . . 94
Centrurus limpidus Karsch, 1879 and *Centruroides ornatus* Pocock, 1902 (Arachnia, Scorpiones). O. F. Francke 97
Leucaspis Signoret, 1869 (Insecta, Homoptera, Diaspididae). E. M. Danzig & I. M. Kerzhner 101
Tomiopsis Benediktova, 1956 (Spiriferida, Brachiopoda). N. W. Archbold & G. A. Thomas. 105
CAECILIIDAE in Amphibia and Insecta (Psocoptera). H. M. Smith & J. T. Polhemus 108
Laspeyresia Hübner. [1825] (Insecta, Lepidoptera). V. I. Kuznetsov & I. M. Kerzhner 110
Byrrhus murinus Fabricius, 1794 (Coleoptera, Byrrhidae). M. Mroczkowski 114
Rhopalocerus W. Redtenbacher, 1842 (Coleoptera, Colydidae) M. Mroczkowski 116
Capys Hewitson (1865) (Lepidoptera, Lycaenidae). A. Penrose. . . . 119
Hyla lactea Daudin, 1803 (Amphibia). J. D. Lynch & W. E. Duellman . 122
Cochliomyia Townsend, 1915 (Diptera, Calliphoridae). The Secretary . 125
Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology 129
Special Announcements 130
On the type species of *Anolis* Daudin, 1802. E. E. Williams & H. M. Smith; A. F. Stimson 132
On the proposed use of the plenary powers to suppress the holotype and to designate a neotype for *Galago crassicaudatus* E. Geoffroy, 1812 (Primates, Galagidae). W. F. H. Ansell 136
On the proposed designation of a type species for *Indodorylaimus* Ali & Prabha, 1974 (Nematoda, Dorylaimida). M. R. Siddiqi; Q. H. Baqri 137
On the proposal to emend Z.N.(S.)2401 by designating *Apis pilipes* as type species of *Megilla* Fabricius. C. D. Michener 138
Explication du vote sur le projet de la troisième édition du Code International de Nomenclature Zoologique. C. Dupuis 141
International Code of Zoological Nomenclature: amendment proposed to third edition. Proposal concerning Article 51c. R. J. Gagné & F. C. Thompson and L. V. Knutson 149
International Code of Zoological Nomenclature: proposed amendment to third edition: Article 59b. Z. Boucek 151
Request for a declaration clarifying the meaning of the expressions 'Suppressed for Nomenclatural Purposes' and 'Rejected for Nomenclatural Purposes' and the status of information in works that are rejected under Articles 8 and 9 of the Code, L. B. Holthuis, W. D. L. Ride and C. W. Sabrosky 152
A proposed amendment to Article 70b of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature on misidentified type species. C. W. Sabrosky 156

Comment on Dr Sabrosky's proposed amendment to Article 70. The Secretary 158
Williamia Monterosato, 1884 (Mollusca, Gastropoda): proposed conservation. H. B. Rehder 159
Tibicina Amyot, 1847 and *Lyristes* Horváth, 1926 (Insecta, Hemiptera, Homoptera): proposed conservation by the suppression of *Tibicen* Berthold, 1827. R. V. Melville and R. W. Sims 163
Arguments pour la suppression du nom de genre *Tibicen* et de ses dérivés dans la nomenclature de la superfamille des CICADOIDEA. M. Boulard 166
Rana maculata Brocchi, 1877 and *Eleutherodactylus richmondi* Stejneger, 1904 (Amphibia, Salienta): proposed conservation. The Secretary . 185
Hypocryphalus mangiferae (Stebbing, 1914), (Insecta, Coleoptera): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. S. L. Wood 189
Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology 191
Financial Report for 1983 193
International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, Third Edition . . . 196
Capys Hewitson,1865 (Lepidoptera, Lycaenidae). C.F. Cowan 197
Heliconius erato Aurivillius, 1882 (Insecta, Lepidoptera). J.R.G. Turner . 197
Sternotherus Gray, 1825 and *Pelusios* Wagler, 1830 (Reptilia, Testudines). R. Bour & A. Dubois 198
Gnathodus Pander, 1856 and *Polygnathus bilineatus* Roundy (Conodonta). The Secretary 205
CAECILIIDAE in Amphibia and Insecta (Psocoptera). T.E. Moore . . 207
Adianthus bucatus Ameghino, 1891 (Mammalia). R.M. Schoch 208
Atractocera latipes Meigen, 1804, D. C. Curry; T. K. Crosby 211
Opinion 1277. *Ptilium* Gyllenhal, 1827 and *Ptenidium* Erichson, 1845 (Insecta, Coleoptera). 212
Opinion 1278. *Rhincodon* A. Smith, 1829 (Pisces) 215
Opinion 1279. *Chrysolina* Motschulsky, 1860 (Insecta, Coleoptera) . . 218
Opinion 1280. Rafinesque, C.S., 1822 'On the Turtles of the United States': suppressed 221
Opinion 1281. *Acmaea limatula* Carpenter, 1864 (Mollusca, Gastropoda) 223
Opinion 1282. *Panopeus* H. Milne Edwards, 1834 (Crustacea, Decapoda) 225
Opinion 1283. LYMANTRIIDAE Hampson, [1893] precedence over ORGYIIDAE Wallengren 1861, and DASYCHIRIDAE Packard, 1864 (Insecta, Lepidoptera) 227
Opinion 1284. *Peggichisme* Kirkaldy, 1904 (Hemiptera, Heteroptera) . 231
Opinion 1285. *Barbus altianalis* Boulenger, 1900 and *Barbus rueppelli* Boulenger, 1902 (Pisces, Cyprinidae) 233
Opinion 1286. *Chermes fusca* Zetterstedt, 1828 (Insecta, Homoptera). . 235
Opinion 1287. *Sesia andrenaeformis* Laspeyres, 1801 (Insecta, Lepidoptera) 238
THRESKIORNITHIDAE Richmond, 1917 and PLATALEINAE Bonaparte, 1838 (Aves). E. Eisenmann (deceased), E. Mayr & K.C. Parkes. 240
Cricetodon minus [sic] Lartet, 1851 (Mammalia, Rodentia). The Secretary 245
Glyphipterix Hübner, [1825]. (Insecta, Lepidoptera). The Secretary . . 250
Octolasion Örley, 1885; *Octolasion (Octodrilus)* Omodeo, 1956; *Octolasion (Incolore)* Omodeo, 1952 and *Octolasion (Purpureum)* Omodeo, 1952 (Annelida, Oligochaeta, Lumbricidae). R.W. Sims . 254

Leptosia Hübner, 1818 (Insecta, Lepidoptera). C.F. Cowan 259
Diplosoma MacDonald, 1859; *Leptoclinum fulgens* Milne Edwards, 1841 (Ascidiacea). F.W.E. Rowe 260
Drymus ryeii Douglas & Scott, 1865 (Hemiptera, Lygaeidae). L. Jessop . 263
Aphodius rufus Moll, 1782; *Aegialia rufa* Fabricius, 1792 & *Aphodius scybalarius* Fabricius, 1792 (Insecta, Coleoptera). Z. Stebnicka . . 265
PYGOPIDAE (Brachiopoda). F.A. Middlemiss 267
Delphinus truncatus Montagu, 1821; *Delphinus nesarnack* Lacépède, 1804 (Mammalia, Cetacea). D.W. Rice 274
Index to Authors 276
List of Decisions in this volume 277
Names placed on Official Lists and Indexes in Decisions published in this volume 279
Index to Key Names. 281
Corrigenda. 287
Particulars of the dates of publication of the several parts in which the present volume was published 287
Instructions to Binder 288

2702

29 March 1984 Volume 41 Part 1
pp. i–ii, 1–66

ISSN 0007–5167

The Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature

The Official Organ of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

BRITISH MUSEUM
(NATURAL HISTORY)
19 APR 1984
PURCHASED
ZOOLOGY LIBRARY

© International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
c/o British Museum (Natural History)
Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD

Price £10.00 (All rights reserved).

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

President: Dr. W.D.L. RIDE *(School of Applied Science, Canberra College of Advanced Education, P.O. Box 1, Belconnen, A.C.T. 2616, Australia).*
Vice-President: Prof. Per BRINCK *(Ecology Building, University of Lund, S-223 62, Lund, Sweden).*
Secretary: Mr. R.V. MELVILLE *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD).*

B. The Members of the Commission

(Arranged in order of election or of most recent re-election)

Prof. Per BRINCK *(Ecology Building, University of Lund, S-223 62, Lund, Sweden)* (30 September 1972) *(Vice-President)* **Arthropoda; Ecology**
Prof. Dr. Raphael ALVARADO *(Departamento de Zoologia, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Madrid, Madrid 3, Spain)* (30 September 1972) **Echinoidea; Asteroidea**
Prof. E. BINDER *(Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle, CH 1211 Geneva 6, Switzerland)* (30 September 1972) **Mollusca**
Dr. L.B. HOLTHUIS *(Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands)* (30 September 1972) *(Councillor)* **Crustacea**
Dr. G. BERNARDI *(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005, Paris, France)* (30 September 1972) *(Councillor)* **Lepidoptera**
Prof. C. DUPUIS *(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005, Paris, France)* (30 September 1972) **Heteroptera**
Dr. M. MROCZKOWSKI *(Instytut Zoologiczny, Polska Akademia Nauk. ul. Wilcza 64, Warsaw, Poland)* (14 March 1975) **Coleoptera**
Prof. Dr. Otto KRAUS *(Zoologisches Institut und Zoologisches Museum, 2000 Hamburg 13, Germany)* (29 September 1976) **Arachnida, Myriapoda**
Dr. W.D.L. RIDE *(School of Applied Science, Canberra College of Advanced Education, P.O. Box 1, Belconnen, A.C.T. 2616, Australia)* (29 September 1976) *(President):* **Mammalia: Recent and Fossil**
Dr. Curtis W. SABROSKY *(Systematic Entomology Lab., USDA c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.)* (29 September 1976) *(Councillor)* **Diptera**
Dr. H.G. COGGER *(Australian Museum, Sydney 2000, N.S.W. Australia)* (29 September 1976) **Reptilia; E D P Methods**
Prof. Dr. Gerhard HAHN *(Fachbereich Geowissenschaften, Universitätsgebiet Lahnberge, 3550 Marburg, BRD)* (27 December 1978) **Palaeontology**
Prof. Dr. O. HALVORSEN *(Institute of Biology and Geology, University of Tromsö, P.O. Box 790, N-9001 Tromsö, Norway)* (27 December 1978) **Parasitology**
Dr. V.A. TRJAPITZIN, *(Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad B-164, USSR)* (27 December 1978) **Entomology**
Dr. F.M. BAYER *(U.S. National Museum of Natural History, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.)* (23 August 1979) **Octocorallia; Systematics**

Prof. John O. CORLISS *(University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, U.S.A.)* (23 August 1979) **Protozoa; Systematics**

Mr. R.V. MELVILLE *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD)* (23 August 1979) *(Secretary)* **Palaeontology**

Dr. Y.I. STAROBOGATOV *(Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad 199164, U.S.S.R.)* (23 August 1979) **Mollusca, Crustacea**

Dr. P.T. LEHTINEN, *(Zoological Museum, Department of Biology, University of Turku. SF-20500 Turku 50, Finland)* (8 August 1980) **Arachnida**

Dr. L.R.M. COCKS *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London, SW7 5BD)* (26 August 1982) **Brachiopoda**

Mr. David HEPPELL *(Department of Natural History, Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh EH1 1JF, Scotland)* (26 August 1982) *(Councillor)* **Mollusca**

Prof. Jay M. SAVAGE *(Department of Biology, University of Miami, P.O. Box 249118, Coral Gables, Florida 33124, U.S.A.)* (26 August 1982) **Herpetology**

Prof. R. SCHUSTER *(Institut für Zoologie, Universität Graz, Universitätsplatz 2, A–8010 Graz, Austria)* (26 August 1982) **Acari**

Dr. SHUNICHI UENO *(Department of Zoology, National Science Museum, Hyakunincho 3–23–1. Shinjukuku, Tokyo 160, Japan)* (26 August 1982) **Entomology**

Prof. A. WILLINK *(Universidad Nacional de Tucumán, Instituto Miguel Lillo, Miguel Lillo 205, 4000 Tucumán, Argentina)* (26 August 1982) **Neotropical Hymenoptera**

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Members of the Trust

Sir Peter E. Kent, F.R.S. *(Chairman)*
Dr. F.G.W. Jones *(Secretary and Managing Director)*
Prof. Per Brinck
Prof. J.H. Callomon, F.R.S.C.
Prof. C.B. Cox, T.D.
Prof. D. Curry, F.G.S.
The Rt. Hon. the Earl of Cranbrook
Sir Arthur Drew, K.C.B.
Sir Charles Fleming, K.B.E., F.R.S.
Prof. J. Forest
Col. Francis J. Griffin, O.B.E.
Dr. G.C. Gruchy
Dr. R.H. Hedley
Dr. L.B. Holthuis
Prof. Dr. O. Kraus
Dr. M. Luc
Dr. I.W.B. Nye
Dr. E.P.F. Rose, T.D.
Dr. W.D.L. Ride *(ex officio)*
Sir Eric Smith, F.R.S.
Dr. G.B. White
Prof. J.M. Dodd, F.R.S. *(Observer for the Royal Society)*

B. The Officers of the Trust

Mr. R.V. Melville, M.Sc. *(Scientific Controller)*
Mr. A. Penrose, B.Sc. *(Assistant Zoologist)*

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 41, part 1 (pp. i–ii, 1–66) 29 March 1984

NOTICES

(a) *Date of commencement of voting.* In normal circumstances the Commission may start to vote on applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* six months after the publication of each application. Any zoologist who wishes to comment on any of the applications in the present part is invited to send his contribution, in duplicate, to the Secretariat of the Commission as quickly as possible, and in any case in time to reach the Secretariat before the close of the six-month period.

(b) *Possible use of the plenary powers.* The possible use by the Commission of its plenary powers is involved in the following applications published in the present part of the *Bulletin* (any marked with an asterisk involve the application of Articles 23a-b and 79b):

(1) *Heliconius erato* Aurivillius, 1882 (Insecta, Lepidoptera): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 1759. J.R.G. Turner.

(2) *Curculio picirostris* Fabricius, 1787 and *Tychius stephensi* Schönherr, 1836 (Coleoptera, Curculionidae): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2266. W.E. Clark.

(3) *Dapsilarthra* Foerster, 1862 (Insecta, Hymenoptera): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2312. C. van Achterberg.

(4) *Adianthus bucatus* Ameghino, 1891 (Mammalia): proposed designation of a neotype under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2430. R.F. Cifelli & M.F. Soria.

(5) Status of the names *Callionymus sagitta* Pallas, 1770 and *Callionymus filamentosus* Valenciennes, 1837 (Teleostei, Callionymidae) and request to make an exception from Article 75c (4) and (5) for designating a neotype for *Callionymus sagitta* Pallas, 1770. Z.N.(S.) 2435. R. Fricke.

*(6) *Siphonosoma cumanense* Keferstein, 1867 proposed conservation over *Siphonosoma edule* Pallas, 1774 (Sipuncula). Z.N.(S.) 2379. E.B. Cutler.

(7) *Pellonula bahiensis* Steindachner, 1879 (Pisces): proposed replacement of lectotype. Z.N.(S.) 2445. P.J.P. Whitehead & G. Nelson.

(c) *Receipt of new applications.* The following new applications have been received since the publication of vol. 40(4) on 30 December

1983 (any marked with an asterisk involve the application of Articles 23a–b and 79b.):

(1) *Trioxycanus* Dumbleton, 1966 (Insecta, Lepidoptera, Hepialidae): misidentification. Z.N.(S.) 2462. J.S. Dugdale.

*(2) *Antispila* Hübner, [1925] (Insecta, Lepidoptera, Heliozelidae): proposed conservation of existing usage. Z.N.(S.) 2463. E.S. Nielsen & I.W.B. Nye.

(3) *Berytus* Fabricius, 1803 (Insecta, Heteroptera, Berytidae): proposed designation of a type species under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2464. W.R. Dolling.

*(4) *Zonosaurus* Boulenger, 1887 (Reptilia, Sauria) and *Aspidosaurus* Broili, 1904 (Amphibia, Labyrinthodonta): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2465. E.R. Brygoo.

(5) *Stenoderna tolteca* Saussure, 1860 (Mammalia, Chiroptera): request for invalidation of neotype and validation of the rediscovered holotype. Z.N.(S.) 2466. L. de Roguin & C. Weber.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

RESIGNATION

The Commission deeply regrets to announce that ill health has compelled Professor H.E. Welch to resign. He was elected in 1976. His valuable services will be greatly missed.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Since the last list of donors to the Appeal Fund was published in volume 40, part 4 on 30 December 1983 donations have been received from:

The Royal Society; The Agricultural Research Council; The Natural Environment Research Council; Science and Engineering Research Council (all U.K.); Lt.-Col. F.J. Griffin; Dr C.G. Adams; Dr G.A. Brett, Dr J.E. Cooper; Dr D.E. Bignell; Lt.-Col. C.F. Cowan; Professor J.D. Gillett; Dr J. Smart; Mr F.G. Browne; Mr G.A. Brett; Dr J.A. Raybould; Mr J.A. Reid; Dr A. Marshall; Dr A. Pittaway; Royal Geological Society of Glasgow; Mr W.H. Ansell; Dr T.B. Larsen; the Japanese Society of Systematic Zoology; the Entomological Society of Japan; the

Arachnological Society of East Asia; Ito Foundation for the Advantage of Fishery; and the Biogeographical Society of Japan; Professor Imamura; and Dr Homma, with other researchers in Ichthyology at Niigata University of Japan. The following have kindly signed Deeds of Covenant: Mr H.E. Chipperfield; Professor A. Macfadyen; Dr E.P. Rose; Dr E.T. Burtt; Mr M. Birch; Mr P.M. Miles; Dr C.P. Haines; Dr J. Brady; Lt.-Col. Eliot; Dr M. Hull; Dr L.G. Higgins; Dr A. Bedford Russell; Sir Cyril Clarke, FRS; Miss J.J. Rowe; Mr E.S. Lewis; Mr R.M. Gambles and Mr J.A. Reid.

Second annual payments have been received on a number of covenants. This method of payment enables the Trust to gauge more accurately part of the yearly income towards the target of £70,000 to set the secretariat on a sound financial footing and ensure the continued provision of the necessary level of scientific service for Zoological Nomenclature.

Many of these donors have responded to a direct-mail approach to fellows of the Royal Entomological Society of London and the Trust is most grateful to Professor Van Emden, FRS, President of the Society, and to the Council for permission to make this approach. The donations from Japanese Societies were coordinated by Dr Syoziro Asahina, President of the Japanese Society of Systematic Zoology, and our warmest thanks are offered to him and all others who have and continue to support the Commission. The total amount received as a result of the Appeal (including the grossed up value of the covenants) is over £80,000. The balance in the account at 18 January 1984 was over £56,000.

The Trust and Commissioners extend warmest congratulations to one of the Patrons of the Appeal: Professor Sir Richard Southwood, FRS, on his knighthood in the New Year's Honours List. Sir Richard has generously given much support to the Appeal and the Trust greatly appreciates his help.

R.V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
March 1984

CONTACTS WITH REPRESENTATIVE ORGANISATIONS IN ALL FIELDS OF ZOOLOGY

By R.V. Melville (*Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

This notice has already been published in *Search (the journal of science in Australia and New Zealand)* vol. 14, No. 7–8, August/September 1983, pp. 178–179. It has also been sent to the Editors of *Nature* and of the *New Scientist*.

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature attaches particular importance to developing contacts with international representative organisations in all fields of zoology. It aims in this way to compensate for the reduction of working contacts with a wide range of zoologists formerly provided by the International Congresses of Zoology. The Commission seeks to encourage such organisations to take the initiative in establishing such contacts because it believes that that is the approach most likely to be beneficial. Any such body that desires to improve communications in matters of zoological nomenclature is therefore cordially invited to approach the Commission directly, specifying its relationship with the International Union of Biological Sciences (IUBS), or another ICSU Union.

The Commission is already in touch with the relevant organisations in mammalogy and ornithology. A contact of the kind envisaged has recently been established with the International Palaeontological Association (IPA). The present informal relationship is expected to develop on more formal lines when IPA's reform of its constitution has been completed in 1984. At present, exchanges are expected to take the form of reference to the IPA by the Commission's secretariat of cases with a palaeontological element, for advice to the Commission; and of approaches to the Commission by the IPA on areas of nomenclature of particular concern to palaeontologists. Opportunities for more positive forms of collaboration will no doubt arise in the future.

Enquiries should be addressed to R.V. Melville, ICZN, c/o British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.

FURTHER COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSAL TO VALIDATE *CARDIUM CALIFORNIENSE* DESHAYES, 1839. (MOLLUSCA, CARDIIDAE). Z.N.(S.)2073

(see vol. 31, p. 238 and vol. 32, p. 204)

(1) By D. Heppell (*Royal Scottish Museum, Department of Natural History, Edinburgh EH1 1JF*)

There are a number of aspects of this case which to me are unsatisfactory, either in the particular proposals of the application or in the general application of the Code to such cases involving subjective synonymy. In a hypothetical example involving the three nominal taxa *A-us x-us* Smith, 1800, *A-us y-us* Brown, 1810 and *A-us z-us* Jones, 1820, suppose authors have consistently regarded *A-us y-us* as a junior subjective synonym of *A-us x-us*. If Robinson now declares that, contrary to all previous opinion, *A-us y-us* is really an unused senior synonym of *A-us z-us*, it is neither reasonable nor logical for him to cite ten uses of *A-us z-us* (in compliance with Article 79b) as supporting evidence for the suppression of *A-us y-us*. Surely Article 79b can be invoked only in cases of unused senior synonyms where the identity of the senior name has already been accepted as a synonym of the junior name for which general usage is claimed.

In the present case involving *Cardium ciliatum* Fabricius, 1780, *C. boreale* Broderip & Sowerby, 1829 and *C. californiense* Deshayes, 1839, *C. boreale* was regarded as a junior synonym of *C. ciliatum* by Dall, 1901, and subsequently by Grant & Gale, 1931, Clench & Smith, 1944, and Abbott, 1974. I know of no suggestion, prior to Kafanov's application, that *C. boreale* might be a synonym of *C. californiense*. Even in Kafanov's own taxonomic paper (1974) on *Clinocardium*, in which he might have been expected to present detailed evidence for such a synonymy, there is no mention of *C. boreale*.

In the absence of type material, Kafanov's claim for the synonymy of *C. boreale* with *C. californiense* rests solely on the basis of the original description, particularly the words 'numerous close-set rounded ribs'. According to Kafanov, *C. ciliatum* has 'relatively sparse radial ribs', but as the usual number is 32 to 38 they could nevertheless quite reasonably be described as numerous. A comparison of the two species as illustrated by Grant & Gale (1931, pl. 19) shows *C. ciliatum* (fig. 11) with about 36 ribs and an Alaskan specimen of *C. californiense* (fig. 16) with the same number. Habe & Ito (1965, pl. 44, figs 2, 3) illustrate Japanese specimens of the two species each with about 32 ribs, those of *C. ciliatum* being more closely-set than those of *C. californiense*. The described shape of the ribs—'rounded'—does suggest *C. californiense* rather than *C. ciliatum*, although this character varies with size, age and degree of wear.

In *C. ciliatum* the angularity of the ribs decreases considerably from anterior to posterior (Grant & Gale, 1931, pl. 19, fig. 11; Abbott, 1974, p. 487, fig. 5583). Dall (1907), when describing the related *C. fucanum*, comments on 'the angulation... which is characteristic of *C. ciliatum* in the young stages', implying that this is less evident in older shells. The original description states: 'the two ends nearly equal in length, the posterior being slightly angulated'. *C. ciliatum* is the more equilateral of the two species. In my opinion the original description of *C. boreale*, with the single exception of the words 'rounded ribs' fits *C. ciliatum* at least as well as *C. californiense* and, from the stated dimensions

of length 1·6 inches, height 1·3 inches, is possibly even more appropriate for *C. fucanum*, a species known from the southern Bering Sea but not so far recorded from the area of Icy Cape.

All this, however, is a matter of subjective taxonomic judgement. What concerns me is that Kafanov's argument for the synonymy of *C. boreale* with *C. californiense*, on which his request for the suppression of *C. boreale* is based, has not been subjected to critical appraisal as it has not been published anywhere other than in the application itself. Is it not premature for the Commission to take any action in a case requiring the use of plenary power in which the reasons for the proposals derive, in the absence of any type material, entirely from unproven assumptions made by the applicant and which are contrary to all previous interpretations? Would not any action taken by the Commission seem to endorse Kafanov's 'assurance' and so prejudice any future work on the taxonomy of *Clinocardium* species from an as yet poorly investigated faunal area?

As to the question (if the application is accepted) of whether *C. boreale* Broderip & Sowerby should be suppressed for both priority and homonymy, or priority only, there is clearly a misunderstanding here. For at least as long as *C. boreale* Broderip & Sowerby has been accepted as a junior synonym of *C. ciliatum*, *C. boreale* Reeve, 1845, has been accepted as a junior synonym of *C. groenlandicum* Bruguière, 1789. Its validity is thus not affected by any decision concerning *C. boreale* Broderip & Sowerby, except that if the latter were suppressed for homonymy as well as priority it is open for someone to resurrect *C. boreale* Reeve by claiming it not to be a junior synonym after all. The reply by Kafanov, in response to the question raised by Professor Mayr, that it is not his intention that *C. boreale* Reeve should remain invalid, is therefore misleading, and the Commission would avoid possible future problems by considering only the original proposal to suppress *C. boreale* Broderip & Sowerby for priority but *not* for homonymy. To do otherwise would be contrary to the guiding principles concerning the use of plenary power as expressed in Article 79a(ii).

(2) By the Secretary (*International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, c/o British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD*)

This application was sent out to the Commissioners for voting on by March 1980 in V.P.79(25). Commissioner David Heppell voted against the proposal, sending in the above comment which was immediately sent to Dr Kafanov. Unfortunately, despite letters sent to him following up this additional information, we have not received a reply. I have myself had another look at the application and can see nothing in it to suggest that the synonymy of *C. boreale* with *C. californiense* is of long standing and it would appear that, although Dr Starobogatov supports Dr Kafanov in this application, no other malacologist has drawn our attention to the point.

I propose, therefore, to close this case unless I hear to the contrary within six months of the publication of this Bulletin.

Dr Myra Keen assures me that the citation of her name in support of Dr Kafanov must be due to a misunderstanding or a mistranslation of her. In fact she shares Mr Heppell's view of the case.

REFERENCES

ABBOTT, R. T. 1974. *American Seashells.* 2nd edn. New York.

CLENCH, W. J. & SMITH, L. C. 1944. The family Cardiidae in the Western Atlantic. *Johnsonia,* vol. 1(13), pp. 1–32.

DALL, W. H. 1901. Synopsis of the family Cardiidae and of the North American species. *Proc. U.S. natn. Mus.* vol. 23, pp. 381–392.

—— 1907. A new *Cardium* from Puget Sound. *Nautilus* vol. 20, pp. 111–112.

GRANT, U. S., IV & GALE, R. H. 1931. Catalogue of the marine Pliocene and Pleistocene Mollusca of California and adjacent regions, etc. *Mem. S. Diego Soc. nat. Hist.,* vol. 1, pp. 1–1036.

HABE, T. & ITO, K. 1965. *Shells of the World in colour.* 1. The Northern Pacific. Osaka.

KAFANOV, A. I. 1974. Sostav, sistematika i istoriya razvitiya gruppy *Clinocardium* (Mollusca, Cardiidae). *Zool. Zh.* vol. 53, pp. 1466–1475.

OPINION 1264
OSCINIS PLUMIGERA LOEW, 1860 (INSECTA, DIPTERA): SUPPRESSION BY USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, the specific name *plumigera* Loew, 1860, as published in the binomen *Oscinis plumigera,* is hereby suppressed for purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy.

(2) The specific name *plumigera* Loew, 1860, as published in the binomen *Oscinis plumigera,* and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1127.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2146

An application for the use of the plenary powers to suppress the specific name *plumigera* Loew, 1860, was first received from Dr C. W. Sabrosky (*U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C. 20560*) on 18 September 1975. It was sent to the printer on 3 July 1979 and published on 25 October 1979 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 191–192. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the Bulletin as well as to the statutory serials, to eight general serials and seven specialist serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 6 July 1983 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1983)1 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, p. 192. At the close of the voting period on 6 October 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — sixteen (16) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Schuster, Willink, Mroczkowski, Savage, Hahn, Starobogatov, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Bayer, Binder, Corliss, Ride, Brinck, Halvorsen

Negative Vote — one (1) Dupuis.

Sabrosky abstained. Alvarado, Cocks, and Heppell all returned late affirmative votes. Welch was on leave of absence. No voting papers were returned by Kraus, Bernardi, Lehtinen and Cogger.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Dupuis: 'Je vote contre, car j'estime que nous sommes en présence d'une simple homonymie secondaire. Ce qui est en cause n'est d'ailleurs pas la requête de Sabrosky, mais la définition tout à fait mauvaise de l'homonymie dans le Code.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCE

The following is the original reference to the name placed on an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

plumigera, Oscinis, Loew, 1860, *Öfvers. K. Vetenskaps-Akad. Förh.*, vol. 17, p. 95.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (1983)1 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1264.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary,
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
29 November 1983

OPINION 1265
BELLOTA PECKHAM & PECKHAM, 1892 (ARANEAE, SALTICIDAE): TYPE SPECIES DESIGNATED UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING. — (1) All designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Bellota* Peckham & Peckham, 1892 are hereby set aside and the nominal species *Bellota peckhami* Galiano, 1978 is designated as type species of that genus.

(2) The generic name *Bellota* Peckham & Peckham, 1892 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Bellota peckhami* Galiano, 1978, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2203.

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *peckhami* Galiano, 1978, as published in the binomen *Bellota peckhami* (specific name of the type species of *Bellota* Peckham & Peckham, 1892) (Name Number 2875);

(b) *formicina* Taczanowski, 1879, as published in the binomen *Chirothecia formicina* (Name Number 2876).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2294

An application for the use of the plenary powers to designate a type species for *Bellota* Peckham & Peckham, 1892, was first received from Dr María Elena Galiano (*Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales 'Bernardino Rivadavia', Av. Angel Gallardo 470, Buenos Aires, Argentina*) on 24 November 1978. It was sent to the printer on 8 May 1979 and published on 18 February 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 236–238. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the Bulletin as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and two specialist serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 6 July 1983 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1983)2 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 237–238. At the close of the voting period on 6 October 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — seventeen (17) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Willink, Mroczkowski, Hahn, Starobogatov,

Trjapitzin, Uéno, Schuster, Bayer, Sabrosky, Binder, Dupuis, Corliss, Ride, Brinck, Halvorsen

Negative Vote — none.

Welch was on leave of absence. Alvarado, Cocks, and Heppell all returned late affirmative votes. No voting papers were returned by Bernardi, Kraus, Lehtinen, Savage and Cogger.

No comment was received.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Bellota Peckham & Peckham, 1892, *Occas. Pap. nat. Hist. Soc. Wisconsin* vol. 2, p 67

peckhami, Bellota, Galiano, 1978, *Rev. peruana Entomol.,* vol. 21(1), p. 27

formicina, Chirothecia, Taczanowski, 1879, *Bull. Soc. imp. Nat. Moscou* vol. 53(4), pp. 367–368.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (1983)2 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1265.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
1 December 1983

OPINION 1266
COPHIXALUS BOETTGER, 1892 (AMPHIBIA, SALIENTIA): TYPE SPECIES DESIGNATED UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING. — (1) All designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Cophixalus* Boettger, 1892 are hereby set aside and the nominal species *Sphenophryne verrucosa* Boulenger, 1898 is designated as type species of that genus.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Cophixalus* Boettger, 1892 (gender: masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Sphenophryne verrucosa* Boulenger, 1898 (Name Number 2204);

(b) *Oreophryne* Boettger, 1895, (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Oreophryne senckenbergiana* Boettger, 1895 (Name Number 2205).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *verrucosa* Boulenger, 1898, as published in the binomen *Sphenophryne verrucosa* (specific name of type species of *Cophixalus* Boettger, 1892) (Name Number 2877);

(b) *moluccensis* Peters & Doria, 1878, as published in the combination *Microhyla achatina* var. *moluccensis* (the currently valid name for the type species of *Oreophryne* Boettger, 1895) (Name Number 2878).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2298

An application for the use of the plenary powers to designate a type species for *Cophixalus* Boettger, 1892, was first received from Dr J. I. Menzies (*Biology Department, National University, Roma, Lesotho*); Dr M. J. Tyler (*University of Adelaide, South Australia*); and Dr R. G. Zweifel (*American Museum of Natural History, New York, N.Y. 10024, U.S.A.*) on 20 March 1979. It was sent to the printer on 12 April 1979 and published on 18 February 1980 in *Bull. Zool. Nom.*, vol. 36, pp. 231–235. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and two specialist serials. The proposals were supported by Dr W. Ronald Heyer and Dr George R. Zug who comprise the Nomenclature Committee—Herpetology, American Society of Icthyologists and Herpetologists. No other comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 6 July 1983 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1983)3 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 233–234. At the close of the voting period on 6 October 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — eighteen (18) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Schuster, Willink, Mroczkowski, Hahn, Savage, Starobogatov, Trjapitzin, Schuster, Bayer, Sabrosky, Binder, Corliss, Ride, Brinck, Halvorsen and Cogger

Negative Vote — one (1) Uéno.

Welch was on leave of absence. Dupuis abstained. Alvarado, Heppell and Cocks returned late affirmative votes. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Kraus and Lehtinen.

Ride commented: 'While I have no objection to placing the name *Oreophryne moluccensis* Peters & Doria 1878, on the Official List I must ask that the erroneous statement in 11(3)(b) of the application be avoided. A type species is a nominal species, not a taxonomic species, hence it cannot have a "valid name" '.

Dupuis commented: 'Je m'abstiens car j'estime que l'on demande un vote de nomenclature alors que le problème proprement taxinomique n'est pas éclairci — ou présenté — de manière telle que l'on sache s'il faut un ou deux genres taxinomiques pour classer les espèces en cause.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Cophixalus, Boettger, 1892, *Katalog der Batrachier-Sammlung im Museum der Senckenbergischen Naturforschenden Gesellschaft im Frankfurt–am–Main.* (Knauer, Frankfurt), p. 24

Oreophryne Boettger, 1895, *Zool. Anz.*, vol. 18(472), p. 135

verrucosa, Sphenophryne, Boulenger, 1898, *Annali Mus. Genova* (2), xviii, p. 707

moluccensis, Microhyla achatina var. Peters & Doria, 1878, *Ann. Mus. civ. Stor. nat. G. Doria,* vol. 13, p. 428.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (1983)3 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on

Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1266.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
6 December 1983

OPINION 1267
MUSCICAPA RUFICAUDA SWAINSON, 1838 (AVES, MUSCICAPIDAE): NEOTYPE DESIGNATED UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, the holotype of the nominal species *Muscicapa ruficauda* Swainson, 1868, is hereby set aside and the female specimen 'a' cited by Sharpe, 1879, p. 457, is designated as neotype of that species.

(2) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *ruficauda* Swainson, 1838, as published in the binomen *Muscicapa ruficauda,* with an endorsement that the holotype has been set aside by use of the plenary powers, and that specimen numbered 45.1.10.47 in the British Museum (Natural History) as cited by Sharpe, 1879, p. 457, has been designated as neotype of that species (Name Number 2879);

(b) *unicolor* Blyth, 1843, as published in the binomen *Cyornis unicolor* (Name Number 2880).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2270

An application for the use of the plenary powers to designate a neotype for *Muscicapa ruficauda* Swainson, 1838, was first received from the late Mr C. W. Benson (*Department of Zoology, Cambridge University, England*) on 30 June 1978. It was sent to the printer on 17 May 1979 and published on 25 October 1979 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 180–186. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and ten specialist serials. Comment was received from Dr H. E. Walters which was published, together with a reply from the author of the application, in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 136–137 (September 1980). No other comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 6 July 1983 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1983)4 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, p. 184. At the close of the voting period on 6 October 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — sixteen (16) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Willink, Mroczkowski, Hahn, Savage, Starobogatov, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Schuster, Bayer, Binder, Corliss, Ride, Brinck, Halvorsen

Negative Vote — two (2) Sabrosky and Dupuis.

Welch was on leave of absence. Alvarado, Cocks and Heppell returned late affirmative votes. No votes were returned by Lehtinen, Kraus, Bernardi and Cogger.

Sabrosky commented: 'Swainson's holotype was in a readily available collection, and the name was apparently used correctly by immediately succeeding authors (Blyth 1847, *et al.*). Sharpe could certainly have consulted the holotype.'

Dupuis commented: 'Il est au dessus de mes forces de donner raison, contre un parfait holotype existant, à tous les auteurs, si nombreux soient-ils, qui se sont trompés dans le sillage de Sharpe. Une erreur est toujours une erreur, et la qualité de "prestigious work" ne constitue pas un critère supérieur d'availability.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

ruficauda, Muscicapa, Swainson, 1838, *The Naturalists' Library*, Flycatchers, p. 251

unicolor, Cyornis, Blyth, 1843, *J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal,* vol. 12, p. 1007.

The following is the original reference to the proposition of a neotype-designation ratified by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

for *Muscicapa ruficauda* Swainson, 1838 by Benson, C. W., 1979, *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, p. 184.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (1983)4 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1267.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
7 December 1983

OPINION 1268
SIMIA LEUCOPHAEA F. CUVIER, 1807 (MAMMALIA, PRIMATES): SUPPRESSION OF TWO SENIOR SYNONYMS

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers the following specific names are hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy:

(a) *sylvestris* Link, 1795, as published in the binomen *Simia sylvestris*;

(b) *silvestris* Schreber, [1800], as published in the binomen *Simia silvestris*.

(2) The following specific names, both as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *sylvestris* Link, 1795, as published in the binomen *Simia sylvestris* (Name Number 1128);

(b) *silvestris* Schreber, [1800], as published in the binomen *Simia silvestris* (Name Number 1129)

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2303

An application for the suppression of two further senior synonyms of *Simia leucophaea* F. Cuvier, 1807 (already protected against four such synonyms in Opinion 935, when it was placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2420) was first received from Mrs P. H. Napier (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) and Dr C. P. Groves (*Australian National University, Canberra*) on 23 March 1979. It was sent to the printer on 1 August 1979 and published on 18 February 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 239–240. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory journals, to seven general and two specialist journals. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 6 July 1983 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1983)5 for or against the proposals set out in pp. 239–240 of vol. 36 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*. At the close of the voting period on 6 October 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes—eighteen (18) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Schuster, Willink, Mroczkowski, Savage, Hahn,

Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Bayer, Uéno, Sabrosky, Binder, Ride, Dupuis, Halvorsen, Brinck. Corliss

Negative Votes — none (0).

Late affirmative votes were returned by Alvarado and Cocks. Heppell abstained. Welch was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Kraus and Lehtinen.

The following comments were returned with their voting papers by members of the Commission.

Ride: 'No evidence is given of usage of the names it is proposed to suppress. My vote may be counted in the affirmative if the Secretary satisfies himself that there is none. [Mrs Napier searched the literature at my request and assured me that she could find no use of either of the names concerned as a presumably valid name. R.V.M.]

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

silvestris, Simia, Schreber, [1800], *Saügethiere*, Abt. 5, legend of plate 8C

sylvestris, Simia, Link, 1795, *Beyträge Naturges.* vol. 1 (2), p. 61.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes on V.P.(83)5 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1268.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
7 December 1983

OPINION 1269
METRIDIIDAE CARLGREN, 1893 (ANTHOZOA) AND METRIDIIDAE SARS, 1902 (COPEPODA): A RULING TO ELIMINATE THE HOMONYMY

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, the stem of the generic name *Metridia* Boeck, 1865 (Copepoda) for the purposes of Article 29 is hereby ruled to be METRIDIN-.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Metridium* Blainville, 1824 (Anthozoa) (gender: neuter), type species, by monotypy, *Actinia dianthus* Ellis, 1768 (Name Number 2206);

(b) *Metridia* Boeck, 1865 (Copepoda) (gender: feminine), type species by subsequent designation by Sars, 1902, *Metridia armata* Boeck, 1865 (Name Number 2207).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *senilis* Linnaeus, 1761, as published in the binomen *Priapus senilis* (specific name of the senior subjective synonym of *Actinia dianthus* Ellis, the type species of *Metridium* Blainville, 1824) (Name Number 2881);

(b) *longus* Lubbock, 1854, as published in the binomen *Calanus longus* (specific name of the senior subjective synonym of *Metridia armata* Boeck, 1865, the type species of *Metridia* Boeck, 1865) (Name Number 2882).

(4) The following family-group names are hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) METRIDIIDAE Carlgren, 1893 (type genus *Metridium* Blainville, 1824) (Anthozoa) (Name Number 557);

(b) METRIDINIDAE Sars, 1902 (type genus *Metridia* Boeck, 1865) (Copepoda) (Name Number 558).

(5) The family-group name METRIDIIDAE Sars, 1902 (type genus *Metridia* Boeck, 1865) (Copepoda) is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Number 497.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2263

An application for the use of the plenary powers to eliminate the homonymy involving METRIDIIDAE Carlgren, 1893 (Anthozoa) and METRIDIIDAE Sars, 1902 (Copepoda), was first received from Dr Daphne Fautin Dunn (*Department of Invertebrate Zoology, California*

Academy of Sciences, Golden Gate Park, San Francisco, California 94118, U.S.A.) and Dr Kuni Hulsemann (*Biologische Anstalt Helgoland, Palmaille 9, 2 Hamburg 50 BRD*) on 24 April 1978. It was sent to the printer on 16 February 1979 and published on 1 July 1979 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 53–56. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials and three specialist serials. Additional information, which was verified by the Secretary, was published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 156–157.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 6 July 1983 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1983)6 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, p. 55. At the close of the voting period on 6 October 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — eighteen (18) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Schuster, Willink, Mroczkowski, Hahn, Savage, Starobogatov, Trjaptzin, Uéno, Bayer, Sabrosky, Binder, Dupuis (in part), Corliss, Ride, Brinck, Halvorsen

Negative Votes — none (0). Dupuis voted partly against the proposals; on placing *Metridia* Boeck, 1865 (Copepoda) (gender: feminine), type species by subsequent designation by Sars, 1902, *Metridia armata* Boeck, 1865, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology; and against placing the family-group name METRIDIIDAE Sars, 1902 (type genus *Metridia* Boeck, 1865) (Copepoda) on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology.

Welch was on leave of absence. Alvarado, Cocks, and Heppell returned late affirmative votes. No voting papers were returned by Bernardi, Kraus, Lehtinen and Cogger.

Dupuis commented: 'Je vote pour le résultat souhaité, c'est à dire l'emploi des noms METRIDIIDAE Gosse 1858 (Anthozoa) et METRIDINIDAE Sars 1902 em. CINZ (Copepoda), mais je vote contre la procédure 2(b) et 4(b), c'est à dire l'étymologie de METRIDINIDAE fondée sur *Metridia* Boeck. J'estime, en effet, que l'usage des pleins pouvoirs permet de valider l'émendation de Norman, 1878 et de déclarer qu' il existe validement un genre *Metridina* Boeck, 1865 em. Norman, 1878, *Metridia* allant à l'index des incorrect original spellings. Si Sars avait, dès 1902, adopté l'émendation de Norman, l'homonymie des deux noms de familles ne se serait pas produite. Ceci prouve que les anciens auteurs, qui considéraient comme homonymes les noms de même étymologie, faisaient du bon travail.

En tout état de cause, valider une émendation me paraît plus logique que de fabriquer une fausse étymologie en laissant subsister une synonymie inutile *Metridia-Metridina*.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Metridium Blainville, 1824, *Dictionnaire des Sciences Naturelles,* vol. 30 (Mell-Mez), F. G. Levrault, ed. Paris, p. 470

Metridia Boeck, 1865, *Forh. Videnskabs-Selsk. Christiania for 1864,* p. 237

senilis, Priapus, Linnaeus, 1761, *Fauna svecica,* 2nd ed. *Laur. Salvii, Holmiae,* [xlvi], p. 510

longus, Calanus, Lubbock, 1854, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist. ser.* 2, vol. 14, p. 127

METRIDIIDAE Carlgren, 1893, *K. svenska Vetenskapsakad. Handl.,* vol. 25(10), p. 101

METRIDINIDAE Sars, 1902, *An account of the Crustacea of Norway,* vol. 4, parts IX and X, p. 110.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting paper (1983)6 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1269.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
9 December 1983

OPINION 1270
CHRYSOMELA FLAVICORNIS AND *C. TIBIALIS* SUFFRIAN, 1851 (INSECTA, COLEOPTERA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) the specific name *flavicornis* Fabricius, 1787, as published in the binomen *Chrysomela flavicornis,* and all uses of that name prior to its use by Suffrian, 1851, are hereby suppressed for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy;

(b) the specific name *tibialis* Duftschmid, 1825, as published in the binomen *Chrysomela tibialis,* and all uses of that name prior to its use by Suffrian, 1851, are hereby suppressed for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy.

(2) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *flavicornis* Suffrian, 1851, as published in the binomen *Chrysomela flavicornis* (Name Number 2883);

(b) *tibialis* Suffrian, 1851, as published in the binomen *Chrysomela tibialis* (Name Number 2884).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *flavicornis* Fabricius, 1787, as published in the binomen *Chrysomela flavicornis,* and all uses of that name prior to its use by Suffrian, 1851, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (a) above (Name Number 1130);

(b) *tibialis* Duftschmid, 1825, as published in the binomen *Chrysomela tibialis,* and all uses of that name prior to its use by Suffrian, 1851, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above (Name Number 1131).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2246

An application for the conservation of two junior primary homonyms in the Coleopteran family CHRYSOMELIDAE was first received from Dr Hans Silfverberg (*Zoological Museum, University of Helsinki*) on 16 January 1978. After an exchange of correspondence it was sent to the printer on 17 May 1979 and published on 25 October 1979 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 171–174. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the Bulletin, to the statutory serials, to seven general and seven specialist serials. No comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 6 July 1983 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1983)8 either for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, p. 172. At the close of the voting period on 6 October 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — sixteen (16) received in the following order: Melville, Schuster, Willink, Mroczkowski, Hahn, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Bayer, Uéno, Sabrosky, Binder, Ride, Dupuis, Halvorsen, Brinck, Corliss

Negative Votes — none (0).

Late affirmative votes were received from Alvarado, Cocks and Heppell. Holthuis abstained. Welch was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Kraus, Lehtinen and Savage.

Dr Holthuis queried the status of *C. tibialis* Suffrian vis-à-vis *C. tibialis* Duftschmid. Dr Silfverberg replied that there could be no doubt from the context of Suffrian's description that he was describing a different species from the one described by Duftschmid.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

flavicornis, Chrysomela, Fabricius, 1787, *Mantissa Insectorum,* vol. 1, p. 73

flavicornis, Chrysomela Suffrian, 1851, *Linnaea Entomol.,* vol. 5, p. 215

tibialis, Chrysomela, Duftschmid, 1825, *Fauna Austriae,* vol. 3, p. 202

tibialis, Chrysomela, Suffrian, 1851, *Linnaea Entomol.,* vol. 5, p. 259.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast in V.P.(83)8 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion Number 1270.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
8 December 1983

OPINION 1271
POLYNOE SAVIGNY, 1818 (ANNELIDA, POLYCHAETA): TYPE SPECIES DESIGNATED UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, all designations hitherto made for the nominal genus *Polynoe* Savigny, 1818, are hereby set aside, and the nominal species *Polynoe scolopendrina* Savigny, 1812, is designated as type species of that genus.

(2) The generic name *Polynoe* Savigny, 1818 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Polynoe scolopendrina* Savigny, 1822, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2208.

(3) The specific name *scolopendrina* Savigny, 1822, as published in the binomen *Polynoe scolopendrina* (specific name of type species of *Polynoe* Savigny, 1818) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2885.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2288

An application for the use of the plenary powers to designate a type species for *Polynoe* Savigny, 1818, was first received from Mr A. Muir (*Department of Zoology, British Museum (Natural History), London, U.K.*) on 1 October 1978. It was sent to the printer on 16 February 1979 and published on 25 October 1979 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 36, pp. 187–190. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and three specialist serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 6 July 1983 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1983)12 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 36, p. 189. At the close of the voting period on 6 October 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — seventeen (17) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Schuster, Willink, Mroczkowski, Hahn, Starobogatov, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Bayer, Sabrosky, Binder, Dupuis, Corliss, Ride, Brinck, Halvorsen

Negative Vote — none (0)

Welch was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Kraus, Lehtinen, Savage, Cogger and Bernardi. Late affirmative votes were returned by Alvarado, Cocks and Heppell. No comments were received.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Polynoe, Savigny, 1818, *Histoire naturelle des animaux sans vertèbres.* Paris (Deterville & Verdière), vol. 5, p. 308

scolopendrina, Polynoe, Savigny, 1822, In *Description de l'Egypte.* Paris (L'Imprimerie Impériale). *Histoire naturelle,* vol. 1(3), p. 25.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (1983)12 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1271.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
12 December 1983

OPINION 1272
SCIAENA NIBE JORDAN & THOMPSON, 1911 (PISCES): SPECIFIC NAME *NIBE* CONSERVED UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, the specific name *brunneolus* Jordan & Richardson, 1909, as published in the binomen *Pseudotolithus brunneolus,* is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy.

(2) The specific name *nibe* Jordan & Thompson, 1911, as published in the binomen *Sciaena nibe* is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2886.

(3) The specific name *brunneolus* Jordan & Richardson, 1909, as published in the binomen *Pseudotolithus brunneolus,* and as suppressed by use of the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1132.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2226

An application for the use of the plenary powers to suppress the specific name *brunneolus* Jordan & Richardson, 1909, was first received from Dr E. Trewavas (*British Museum (Natural History), London, UK*) on 24 June 1977. It was sent to the printer on 3 July 1979 and published on 25 October 1979 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 36, pp. 155–157. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and one specialist serial. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 6 July 1983 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1983)13 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 36, p. 157. At the close of the voting period on 6 October 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — fourteen (14) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Schuster, Willink, Savage, Starobogatov, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Bayer, Binder, Corliss, Ride, Brinck, Halvorsen

Negative Votes — four (4) received in the following order: Mroczkowski, Hahn, Sabrosky, Dupuis.

Welch was on leave of absence. Alvarado, Cocks and Heppell returned late affirmative votes. No votes were returned by Krauss, Lehtinen, Cogger and Bernardi.

Dupuis commented: 'Si le genre *Atrobucca* est valide "many zoologists, especially those working in applied fields and on fishery statistics" ont dû, depuis 1963, changer le nom de genre! Cela ne leur coûtera pas plus de revenir aujourd'hui à l'épithète spécifique prioritaire. Dans une quinzaine d'années tout cela sera passé dans les moeurs.'

Sabrosky commented: 'It is depressing that three decades ago in 1952 and 1956, before many of the examples cited as usage of *nibe,* two authors failed to apply the Rules.

Hahn commented: 'I would have voted for the "relative precedence procedure", but I do not vote for complete suppression of the older synonym.'

Mroczkowski commented: 'As the specific names *brunneolus* Jordan & Richardson, 1909 and *nibe* Jordan & Thompson, 1911 are only subjective synonyms, the Commission should, in my view, apply the "relative precedence procedure".'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

nibe, Sciaena, Jordan & Thompson, 1911, *Proc. U.S. natn. Mus.*, vol. 39, p. 258

brunneolus, Pseudotolithus, Jordan & Richardson, 1909, *Mem. Carnegie Mus.*, vol. 4, p. 191.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (1983)13 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1272.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
13 December 1983

OPINION 1273
ANASPIS, LUPERUS, LAMPYRIS AND *CLERUS* (INSECTA, COLEOPTERA): DETERMINATION OF AUTHORSHIP AND FIXATION OF TYPE SPECIES

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) it is hereby ruled that the generic names *Anaspis, Luperus, Lampyris* and *Clerus* are to be attributed to Geoffroy, 1762;

(b) All designations of type species for the genera named in column (i) below are hereby set aside and the species given in column (ii) are hereby designated as type species of those genera:

(i)	(ii)
Anaspis Geoffroy, 1762	*Mordella frontalis* Linnaeus, 1758
Luperus Geoffroy, 1762	*Chrysomela flavipes* Linnaeus, 1767
Lampyris Geoffroy, 1762	*Cantharis noctiluca* Linnaeus, 1758
Clerus Geoffroy, 1762	*Clerus mutillarius* Fabricius, 1775

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Anaspis* Geoffroy, 1762 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above, *Mordella frontalis* Linnaeus, 1758 (Name Number 2209);

(b) *Luperus* Geoffroy, 1762 (gender: masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above, *Chrysomela flavipes* Linnaeus, 1758 (Name Number 2210);

(c) *Lampyris* Geoffroy, 1762 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above, *Cantharis noctiluca* Linnaeus, 1758 (Name Number 2211);

(d) *Clerus* Geoffroy, 1762 (gender: masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above, *Clerus mutillarius* Fabricius, 1775 (Name Number 2212);

(e) *Trichodes* Herbst, 1792 (gender: masculine), type species, by subsequent designation by Hope, 1840, *Attelabus apiarius* Linnaeus, 1758 (Name Number 2213).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *frontalis* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Mordella frontalis* (specific name of type species of *Anaspis* Geoffroy, 1762) (Name Number 2887);

(b) *flavipes* Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the binomen *Chrysomela flavipes* (specific name of type species of *Luperus* Geoffroy, 1762) (Name Number 2888);

(c) *noctiluca* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen

Cantharis noctiluca (specific name of type species of *Lampyris* Geoffroy, 1762) (Name Number 2889);

(d) *mutillarius* Fabricius, 1775, as published in the binomen *Clerus mutillarius* (specific name of type species of *Clerus* Geoffroy, 1762) (Name Number 2890);

(e) *apiarius* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Attelabus apiarius* (specific name of type species of *Trichodes* Herbst, 1792) (Name Number 2891).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2240

An application concerning the authorship and type species of the nominal genera *Anaspis, Luperus, Lampyris* and *Clerus* was first received from Dr H. Silfverberg (*University Zoological Museum, Helsinki, Finland*) on 5 December 1977. Dr I. W. B. Nye kindly took responsibility for preparing the case, and after correspondence and personal discussions with Dr Silfverberg, prepared a draft that was sent to the printer on 8 May 1979 and published on 25 October 1979 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 161–166. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and seven specialist serials.

Dr Silfverberg proposed that the generic names involved should be attributed to O. F. Müller, 1764. However, Dr I. M. Kerzhner (*Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Leningrad*) and Dr F. C. Thompson (*Systematic Entomology Laboratory USDA, c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington D.C.*) both proposed that the plenary powers should be used to attribute them to Geoffroy, 1762, *Hist. abr. ins. env. Paris,* a work rejected in Opinion 228 because it was not consistent with the principles of binominal nomenclature. They pointed out that eleven of Geoffroy's generic names had already been ruled to be available by the use of the plenary powers in subsequent opinions. The Secretary pointed out that the Commission could choose one of three courses: (a) to use its plenary powers to rule the names to be available from Geoffroy, 1762; (b) to accept the names from their first subsequent publication as available names (following Opinion 228); or (c) to accept the next names made available for the same taxa. The papers in the case offered a choice between courses (a) and (b) and the Secretary proposed to put these as alternatives to the Commission for a vote. All these comments were published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 6–8, February 1981. No other comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 6 July 1983 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule in Voting Paper (1983)14, in Part 1

for or against the use of the plenary powers to attribute the generic names concerned to Geoffroy, 1762; and in Part 2 for or against the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate type species for those genera. At the close of the voting period on 6 October 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

PART 1

Affirmative Votes — fourteen (14) received in the following order: Melville, Willink, Hahn, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Bayer, Schuster, Uéno, Binder, Sabrosky, Ride, Dupuis, Corliss, Savage

Negative Votes — four (4) received in the following order: Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Halvorsen, Brinck.

Late affirmative votes were received from Heppell and Cocks and a late abstention from Alvarado. Welch was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Kraus and Lehtinen.

PART 2

Affirmative Votes — sixteen (16) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Willink, Mroczkowski, Hahn, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Bayer, Uéno, Sabrosky, Binder, Ride, Halvorsen, Brinck, Corliss, Savage

Negative Vote — Schuster.

Dupuis abstained. Welch was on leave of absence. Late affirmative votes were returned by Heppell and Cocks, and a late abstention by Alvarado. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Kraus and Lehtinen.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Sabrosky: 'Part 1 should have been worded, as requested by Kerzhner & Thompson, "to make available" (they said "to validate") the generic names as of "Geoffroy, 1762". Attributing the authorship to Geoffroy is a weak and imprecise way of making the names available, if indeed it does so.' [I see no difficulty here. Article 50 of the Code says 'The author of a name is the person who first publishes it in a way that satisfies the criteria of availability'. It follows that to rule that a given person is the author of a name is ipso facto to rule that that person made the name available. R.V.M.]

Dupuis: 'Je vote pour la partie 1 de la proposition, c'est à dire dans le sens des Opinions 281, 441, 442, 645, 681, 683 et 731. Ces Opinions indiquent que la Commission, dans son Opinion 228, avait agi avec précipitation en rejetant en bloc le travail de Geoffroy, et surtout qu'un rejet en bloc est toujours une mesure simpliste et dangereuse.

'Je m'abstiens quant à la partie 2 de la proposition. D'une part dans l'attente du vote sur la partie 1, d'autre part parce que j'estime les

quatre noms comme trop importants pour voter dès à present, alors qu'aucun commentaire contradictoire à leur propos n'a apparemment été reçu de coléoptéristes.'

Ride: 'If the vote in Part 1 does not achieve the necessary majority in consequence of Kerzhner's comment, the authorship of the names should be attributed to Geoffroy in Müller, 1764, not Müller, 1764. Note that Part 2 also requires the use of the plenary powers.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:
Anaspis Geoffroy, 1762, *Hist. abr. Ins. env. Paris,* p. 315
apiarius, Attelabus, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 388
Clerus Geoffroy, 1762, *Hist. abr. Ins. env. Paris,* p. 303
flavipes, Chrysomela, Linnaeus, 1767, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 12, vol. 1, p. 601
frontalis, Mordella, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 420
Lampyris Geoffroy, 1762, *Hist. abr. Ins. Env. Paris,* p. 165
Luperus Geoffroy, 1762, *Hist. abr. Ins. env. Paris,* p. 230
mutillarius, Clerus, Fabricius, 1775, *Syst. Entomol.,* p. 157
noctiluca, Cantharis, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 400
Trichodes Herbst, 1792, in Jablonsky, *Natursyst. aller bek. in- und ausl. Ins.,* Der Käfer, p. 154.

The following is the original reference to the designation of a type species for the nominal genus *Trichodes* Herbst, 1792: of *Attelabus apiarius* Linnaeus, 1758, by Hope, 1840, *Coleopterist's Manual,* vol. 3, p. 137.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast in the two parts of V.P.(83)14 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in each of those parts have been adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decisions so taken, being the decisions of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, are truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1273.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
14 December 1983

OPINION 1274
NOTONECTA STRIATA LINNAEUS, 1758 (INSECTA, HEMIPTERA): NEOTYPE DESIGNATED UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, all designations of type specimens hitherto made for the nominal species mentioned below are hereby set aside, and the two specimens indicated are hereby designated as their neotypes as follows:

(a) For *Notonecta striata* Linnaeus, 1758: a microscope slide of a dissected male specimen in the British Museum (Natural History), (the slide bears at one end a red-bordered British Museum type label with the words '*Corixa striata* (Linnaeus, 1758), Neotype', and at the other end a slide label reading 'Denmark, Esrom Lake-9.1950, T. T. Macan Coll., Station 11');

(b) For *Corixa dorsalis* Leach, 1817: a microscope slide of a dissected male specimen in the British Museum (Natural History), (labelled '*Corixa lacustris* Macan, 1954, Holotype. Esthwaite Lake 8.v.51, T. T. Macan'. It also bears the British Museum (Natural History) acquisition number 1954–822).

(2) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *striata* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Notonecta striata* and as defined by the neotype designated under the plenary powers in 1(a) above, with the Name Number 2892;

(b) *dorsalis* Leach, 1817, as published in the binomen *Corixa dorsalis* and as defined by the neotype designated under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above, with the Name Number 2893.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)640

An application to designate a neotype for *Notonecta striata* Linnaeus, 1758, was first received from Dr T. T. Macan (*Stevney, Outgate, Ambleside, Westmorland, U.K.*) on 3 January 1952, and first published in 1961 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 18, pp. 328–329. The present revived application for the use of the plenary powers in this case was sent to the printer on 16 February 1978 and published on 31 October 1978 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 35, pp. 111–114. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and seven specialist serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 6 July 1983 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1983)15 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 35, pp. 113–114. At the close of the voting period on 6 October 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — sixteen (16) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Willink, Mroczkowski, Hahn, Starobogatov, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Schuster, Bayer, Sabrosky, Binder, Dupuis, Corliss, Ride, Brinck

Negative Votes — one (1) Halvorsen.

Welch was on leave of absence. Alvarado, Cocks and Heppell all returned late affirmative votes. No voting papers were returned by Savage, Kraus, Lehtinen, Cogger and Bernardi.

Dupuis commented: 'Je vote pour l'acceptation des deux néotypes simultanément, car en désigner un pour une seule des espèces considérées ne suffirait pas pour parvenir à la stabilité voulue.'

Schuster commented: 'I feel this application will solve a very complex problem.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

striata, Notonecta, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.*, ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 439

dorsalis, Corixa, Leach, 1817, *Trans. linn. Soc. London,* vol. 12, p. 17.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (1983)15 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1274.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
19 December 1983

OPINION 1275
MACROCEPHALITES ZITTEL, 1884, AND *AMMONITES MACROCEPHALUS* SCHLOTHEIM, 1813 (MOLLUSCA, CEPHALOPODA): PLACED ON THE OFFICIAL LISTS

RULING. — (1) The generic name *Macrocephalites* Zittel, 1884 (gender: masculine), type species, by subsequent designation by Lemoine, 1910, *Ammonites macrocephalus* Schlotheim, 1813, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2214.

(2) The specific name *macrocephalus* Schlotheim, 1813, as published in the binomen *Ammonites macrocephalus* (specific name of type species of *Macrocephalites* Zittel, 1884) as interpreted by the neotype designated by Callomon, 1971, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2894.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)401

An application aimed at resolving confusion about the type species of the ammonite genus *Macrocephalites* Zittel, 1884 and about the type specimen of that species was first received from the late W. J. Arkell on 28 February 1949. The reasons why that application was never taken to a conclusion are explained in the application put forward by Professor J. H. Callomon (*University College, London*) on 7 June 1978. This was eventually prepared for printing and sent to the printer on 23 January 1980 and published on 19 June 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 109–113. No use of the plenary powers was involved. No comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 6 July 1983 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1983)16 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 112–113. At the close of the voting period on 6 October 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — sixteen (16) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Willink, Mroczkowski, Hahn, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Schuster, Uéno, Sabrosky, Bayer, Binder, Ride, Halvorsen, Brinck, Corliss

Negative Votes — none (0).

Late affirmative votes were returned by Alvarado, Cocks and Heppell. Dupuis abstained. Welch was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Kraus, Lehtinen and Savage.

Dupuis commented: 'Je m'abstiens car il n'est pas précisé si la solution proposée et les "different interpretations in important

revisions" entraînent des conséquences différentes quant aux usages existants'.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Macrocephalites Zittel, 1884, *Handb. Palaeont.*, vol. 1 (2), (3), p. 470

macrocephalus, Ammonites, Schlotheim, 1813, in Leonhard, *Taschenb. gesamte Mineral.*, vol. 7, p. 70.

The following is the original reference to the designation of a type species for the nominal genus *Macrocephalites* Zittel, 1884: of *Ammonites macrocephalus* Schlotheim, 1813, by Lemoine, 1910, *Ann. Paléont.*, vol. 5, p. 151.

The following is the original reference to the designation of a neotype for the nominal species *Ammonites macrocephalus* Schlotheim, 1813: Callomon, 1971, *Palaeontol.*, vol. 14, p. 120.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(83)16 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1275.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
14 December 1983

OPINION 1276
SEMBLIS MARGINATA PANZER, 1799 (INSECTA, PLECOPTERA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) the specific name *marginata* Fabricius, 1793, as published in the binomen *Semblis marginata,* and all uses of that name prior to its use by Panzer, 1799, are hereby suppressed for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy;

(b) it is hereby ruled that the specific name *marginata* Panzer, 1799, as published in the binomen *Semblis marginata,* is to be given nomenclatural precedence over the specific name *maxima* Scopoli, 1763, as published in the binomen *Phryganea maxima*, by anyone who believes that both names denote the same species-group taxon.

(2) The generic name *Marthamea* Klapálek, 1907 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Klapálek, 1923, *Perla vitripennis* Burmeister, 1839, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2215.

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *marginata* Panzer, 1799, as published in the binomen *Semblis marginata* and as rendered nomenclaturally valid by the ruling under the plenary powers in (1) (a) above and with an endorsement that it is to be given nomenclatural precedence over the specific name *maxima* Scopoli, 1763, as published in the binomen *Phryganea maxima* by anyone who believes that both names denote the same species-group taxon (Name Number 2895);

(b) *maxima* Scopoli, 1763, as published in the binomen *Phryganea maxima,* with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over *marginata* Panzer, 1799, as published in the binomen *Semblis marginata* by anyone who believes that both names denote the same species-group taxon (Name Number 2896);

(c) *vitripennis* Burmeister, 1839, as published in the binomen *Perla vitripennis* (specific name of type species of *Marthamea* Klapálek, 1907) (Name Number 2897).

(4) The specific name *marginata* Fabricius, 1793, as published in the binomen *Semblis marginata,* and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (a) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1133.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1799

The earlier history of this case from 1967 to 1981 was summarised in a report by the Secretary that was sent to the printer on 24 February 1981 and published on 30 July 1981 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 221–224. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and eight specialist serials. No comments were received.

DECISIONS OF THE COMMISSION

The Commission's decisions in the present case were reached in two stages. On 20 August 1979 the members were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule in Voting Paper (1979)10 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 24, pp. 246–247 as modified by the relative precedence procedure: i.e., to give *Semblis marginata* Panzer, 1799 nomenclatural precedence over *Phryganea maxima* Scopoli, 1763. At the close of the voting period on 20 November 1979 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — seventeen (17) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Vokes, Alvarado, Mroczkowski, Willink, Tortonese, Hahn, Trjapitzin, Welch, Brinck, Bernardi, Habe, Corliss, Bayer, Cogger, Nye

Negative Votes — two (2): Sabrosky, Heppell.

Late affirmative votes were returned by Kraus, Halvorsen and Starobogatov. Dupuis abstained. Ride was on leave of absence. No voting paper was returned by Binder.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their votes on V.P.(79)10:

Dupuis: 'Abstention. Le "wording" de la décision n'est pas donné — les faits éventuellement cités dans les documents invoqués ne sont pas fournis aux membres de la Commission.'

Heppell: 'I vote for the application as published, with suppression of *P. maxima*. There seems to be a good case for burying this name altogether as its use in any sense would upset stability.'

In the course of preparing an Opinion on the basis of the above vote, the Secretary found that *Semblis marginata* Panzer, 1799 was a junior primary homonym of *Semblis marginata* Fabricius, 1793. The complications arising from this discovery were explained in the report mentioned above under the history of the case.

On 6 July 1983 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1983)17 on the measures necessary to complete this case as set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, p. 224. At the close of the voting period on 6 October 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — fifteen (15) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Willink, Mroczkowski, Hahn, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Uéno, Schuster, Binder, Bayer, Corliss, Ride, Brinck, Halvorsen

Negative Vote — Sabrosky.

Late affirmative votes were returned by Alvarado, Cocks and Heppell. Dupuis abstained. Welch was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Kraus, Lehtinen and Savage.

Dupuis commented: 'Je suis très heureux de m'être abstenu lors du vote 1979(10). Je persiste dans mon abstention en soulignant que les cas anciens (soumis, par exemple, il y a plus de dix ans) devraient être réexposés intégralement, et non pas en utilisant le système irritant des renvois fractionnés à des textes contradictoires.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

marginata, Semblis, Fabricius, 1793, *Entomol. Syst.*, vol. 2, p. 73

marginata, Semblis Panzer, 1799, *Deutschlands Insekten,* Heft 71, Abth. 3

Marthamea Klapálek, 1907, *Rospr. Ceske Akad.* (2) vol. 16 (16) p. 19

maxima, Phryganea, Scopoli, 1763, *Entomol. Carniol.*, p. 269

vitripennis, Perla, Burmeister, 1839, *Handb. Entomol.* vol. 2 (2), pp. ii, 850.

The following is the original reference to the subsequent designation of a type species for the nominal genus *Marthamea* Klapálek, 1907: of *Perla vitripennis* Burmeister, 1839 by Klapálek, 1923, *Colls zool. Selys Longchamps,* p. 97.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(79)10 and V.P.(83)17 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in both those voting papers have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decisions so taken, being the decisions of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, are truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1276.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
20 December 1983

DIRECTION 114
HERRERA, 1899, 'SINONIMIA VULGAR Y CIENTIFICA DE LOS PRINCIPALES VERTEBRADOS MEXICANOS' PLACED ON THE OFFICIAL INDEX OF REJECTED AND INVALID WORKS IN ZOOLOGY (DIRECTION SUPPLEMENTARY TO DIRECTION 32)

RULING. — The following work is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoological Nomenclature with the Title No. 87 and with an endorsement that the designations for animals used in that work are formulae, not names, and accordingly do not enter into zoological nomenclature:

Herrera, A. L., 1899, *Sinonimía vulgar y científica de los principales vertebrados mexicanos* (Mexico, Officina Tipográfica de la Secretaría de Fomento, 31 pp.).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2133

An application for the placing of the work listed above on the Official Index was first received from Professor Hobart M. and Mrs Rozella Smith (*University of Colorado*) on 17 March 1975. After some bibliographical research, it was sent to the printer on 1 August 1979 and published on 18 February 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 246–248. No use of the plenary powers was involved. No comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 6 July 1983 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1983)10 for or against the proposal set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, p. 248. At the close of the voting period on 6 October 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — seventeen (17) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Willink, Mroczkowski, Hahn, Savage, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Bayer, Uéno, Schuster, Sabrosky, Binder, Ride, Halvorsen, Brinck, Corliss

Negative Vote — Dupuis.

Late affirmative votes were returned by Alvarado and Cocks. A late negative vote was returned by Heppell. Welch was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Kraus and Lehtinen.

Dupuis commented: 'Il n'y a pas lieu de supprimer l'ouvrage en tant que tel. Herrera est suffisamment explicite: "las abbreviaturas que preceden a los nombres genericos. . ." pour que l'on sache que ses formules ne sont pas des noms génériques; elles tombent, de ce fait, automatiquement sous l'effet des dispositions prévues.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCE

The original reference to the work placed on an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Direction is as given in the Ruling above.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast in V.P.(83)10 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Direction No. 114.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
8 December 1983

DIRECTION 115
MEROPIDAE (AVES): ATTRIBUTED TO RAFINESQUE, 1815 (CORRECTION TO ENTRY No. 1 IN THE OFFICIAL LIST OF FAMILY-GROUP NAMES IN ZOOLOGY)

RULING. — Entry No. 1 in the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology is to be amended to read:

MEROPIDAE Rafinesque, 1815, *Analyse de la Nature* (Palermo), p. 66.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2286

An application for the amendment of the author and date of the family-group name MEROPIDAE in entry No. 1 of the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology was first received from Dr P. S. Tomkovich and Dr G. N. Kashin (*Moscow*) on 29 September 1978. It was sent to the printer on 8 May 1979 and published on 25 October 1979 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, p. 154. No use of the plenary powers was involved. No comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 6 July 1983 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1983)11 for or against the proposal set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, p. 154. At the close of the voting period on 6 October 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — seventeen (17) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Schuster, Willink, Mroczkowski, Hahn, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Bayer, Uéno, Sabrosky, Binder, Ride, Dupuis, Halvorsen, Brinck, Corliss

Negative Votes — none (0).

Late affirmative votes were received from Alvarado, Cocks and Heppell. Welch was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Kraus, Lehtinen and Savage.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Hahn: 'I agree with hesitation: (1) is it certain that Rafinesque used "Meropia" in the same sense as MEROPIDAE is used today? (2) is it certain that Rafinesque was indeed the first author of MEROPIDAE or must we expect that other, still earlier authors will be found in future?' [The application showed that Rafinesque used 'Meropia' for a taxon based on *Merops* Linnaeus, 1758, hence with the same meaning as that now given to MEROPIDAE. Time alone holds the answer to Professor Hahn's second question. R.V.M.)

Dupuis: 'Je suis toujours favorable à l'amendement des auteurs et dates des noms de rang familial, car la priorité des informations de cette sorte est toujours très délicate à établir'.

'Dans le cas particulier, je vote donc pour. Je regrette néanmoins le caractère trop sommaire de la requête. Pour m'assurer que Meropia avait été véritablement voulu comme taxon supergénérique par son auteur, j'ai dû consulter le travail de Richmond (*Auk* vol. 26, 1909, pp. 37–55, 248–262). J'ai constaté (1) qu'il s'agit de "A reprint of the ornithological writings of C. S. Rafinesque" (c'est important, car l'existence de ce reprint évite d'avoir à ergoter sur l'accessibilité de l'original) et (2) que Rafinesque, 1815 a créé de nombreux noms de familles et sous-familles, fondés (mais non tous) sur des noms de genres d'oiseaux (certains sont, toutefois, des nomina nuda). On y trouve, en particulier, p. 66 de l'original (p. 44 de *Auk*) "sous-famille Meropia. Les Méropiens" avec le genre *Merops* L. inclus. Il fallait s'assurer de la mention d'un rang supergénérique et d'un genre inclus'.

'J'estime que la requête aurait dû apporter clairement ces précisions aux membres de la Commission et j'espère que mon commentaire aura au moins l'avantage d'attirer l'attention sur un reprint utile et apparemment peu connu.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCE

The original reference to the name that is the subject of the ruling in the present Direction is that given in the Ruling above.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast in V.P.(83)11 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Direction No. 115.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
8 December 1983

HELICONIUS ERATO AURIVILLIUS, 1882 (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.)1759

By John R. G. Turner (*Department of Genetics, University of Leeds, West Yorkshire, England*)

This case deals with two species of butterflies of the genus *Heliconius* Latreille, 1804, viz. *Papilio vesta* Cramer, 1775 and *Papilio erato* Linnaeus, 1758, the names of which have been confused. For the purpose of the discussion it is convenient to assume that there are two species: Species A (a red, monomorphic form) and Species B (a red form, a blue form, and a green form which is not relevant to this discussion).

2. The nomenclature used for 100 years and with which the Linnean types agree is set out in:

Scheme 1 Species A = *Papilio vesta* Cramer, 1775
Species B = (red form) *Papilio erato* Linnaeus, 1758
= (blue form) *Papilio doris* Linnaeus, 1771

3. From Linnaeus' description (*Syst. Nat.* 1758, ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 467), *P. erato* could be one of half a dozen species including A and B (red form). Clerck (1764, *Icones* 2 to 40, fig. 5) figured a fresh specimen of Species B (red form) and called it *Papilio erato* (presumably Linnaeus' species). Linnaeus (1764, *Mus. Lud. Ulr.* p. 231) cited Clerck's figure as *P. erato*. Linnaeus (1771, *Mantissa Plant.* Altera, Appendix) named Species B (blue form) *Papilio doris*. Cramer (1775, *Uitl. Kapellen* vol. 2, 33, p. 199 (fig. a)) illustrated Species A under the new name *Papilio vesta*. Linnaeus (in later editions of *Syst. Nat.*) cited Clerck's and Cramer's figures as *P. erato* (i.e. both A and B (red form)).

4. Aurivillius (1882, *Kongl. svensk. Vet.-Akad. Handl.*) declared that the very full description of *P. erato* in *Mus. Lud. Ulr.* in 1764, could not be Species B (red form), but must be Species A, and consequently designated Cramer's figure as the type of *P. erato*. This designation established the arrangement set out in:

Scheme 2: Species A = *Heliconius erato* Linn. sensu Aurivillius, 1882 (nec. L. 1758) (Synonym *P. vesta* Cramer 1775)
Species B = (red form) *Heliconius doris* (L.) form *delila* Hübner
= (blue form) *Heliconius doris* (L.) typical form.

This arrangement has been followed by all subsequent workers including Stichel, Stichel & Riffarth, Seitz and Neustetter. Starting in 1950 the genus *Heliconius* has been used extensively for biological research, including behaviour, genetics, neurology, ecology and mimicry. A list of relevant research papers is held in the Commission's Office. In all these papers the nomenclature, following Aurivillius, is as in Scheme 2.

5. To return to the Linnean usage of Scheme 1 would cause the utmost confusion, especially as Species A and Species B (red) are apparently mimics. It is in fact doubtful if those zoologists who lack any particular interest in nomenclature would ever get into the habit of using Scheme 1; even if some of them did not actively rebel, the rest would probably ignore it. The only paper of zoological interest which uses Scheme 1 is Bates' classic of 1862, which is now read for historical interest only.

6. I therefore submit that the most sensible course is to follow Scheme 2, and to conserve the name *H. erato* sensu Aurivillius, 1882 by designating a specimen of Species A as neotype of *P. erato* L., 1758. The following specimen is proposed as neotype of *H. erato* sensu Aurivillius housed in the British Museum (Natural History): 'Berg. en Dal. Surinam. 1898–9. Michls./*erato erato* Linn./866./20.20. ex coll. Riffarth/Joicey Bequest, Brit. Mus. 1934–120.' This is very probably the specimen photographed in Stichel & Riffarth (1905, *Das Tiereich*, Lief. 22 Heliconiidae, p. 199).

7. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is therefore requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type specimen hitherto made for *Papilio erato* Linn., 1758, and having done so to designate the specimen now held in the British Museum (Natural History) and as detailed in paragraph 6 above, as neotype of that species;

(2) to place the following specific names
   (a) *erato* Linnaeus, 1758 as published in the binomen *Papilio erato* and as defined by reference to the neotype designated in (1) above, and
   (b) *doris* Linnaeus, 1771, as published in the binomen *Papilio doris* Linnaeus, 1771 on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

CURCULIO PICIROSTRIS FABRICIUS, 1787 AND *TYCHIUS STEPHENSI* SCHÖNHERR, 1836 (COLEOPTERA, CURCULIONIDAE): PROPOSED CONSERVATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.)2266

By Wayne E. Clark (*Department of Zoology–Entomology, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama 36849, U.S.A.*)

Two native European curculionid weevils whose larvae feed on seeds of clover (*Trifolium*) are economic pests in areas where clover is produced as a forage crop (Muka, 1954; Yunus & Johansen, 1967). Both weevils have been introduced from Europe into America. One of the weevils, known to American as well as European workers as *Tychius picirostris* (Fabricius, 1787) (*Mant. Ins.*, vol. 1, p. 101), is also called the clover seed weevil in America. Until recently, this species was known as *Miccotrogus picirostris,* but the name *Miccotrogus* Schönherr, 1825 (*Isis* (Oken), p. 583) has now been placed in synonymy with *Tychius* Germar, 1817 (*Mag. Entomol.* (Germar), vol. 2, p. 340) (Clark, 1976). The other weevil, known in America as *Tychius stephensi* Schönherr, 1836 (*Gen. et sp. Curcul.,* vol. 3 (1), p. 412) (sometimes spelled *stepheni*), is the red clover seed weevil. In Europe it is called *Tychius tomentosus* (Herbst, 1795) (*Nat. Ins.* (Käfer), vol. 6, p. 278). This proposal suggests that the nomenclature used by American workers for these two weevils be ratified. So far as *T. picirostris* is concerned, this will be advantageous to Europeans as well as Americans. As for *T. stephensi,* European workers should not be greatly inconvenienced by the replacement of *T. tomentosus* by this name, since the species does not appear to be of economic importance in Europe.

2. Although similar in general appearance, the two weevil species differ in the number of articles in the antennal funiculus: 6 in *T. picirostris,* 7 in *T. stephensi,* and in other features listed by Milliron, 1949. Nevertheless, in the first half of the present century the two species were frequently mistaken for each other by American workers. Milliron's 1949 listing of diagnostic characters was part of an attempt to eliminate the confusion apparent in the early literature. Milliron followed European authors in using the name *Miccotrogus picirostris* for the clover seed weevil. He rejected the name *Tychius tomentosus* for the species now known as the red clover seed weevil because that name in its original combination (*Curculio tomentosus*) is a junior primary homonym of *Curculio tomentosus* Olivier, 1790 (*Encycl. méth.* vol. 5 (Ins.), p. 536). Milliron decided that *Tychius stephensi* was the correct

name for the red clover seed weevil. Since publication of his paper, the names *picirostris* and *stephensi* have been applied consistently in America (except for variation in the spelling of the latter). However, Milliron's work has had no apparent impact upon European workers.

3. If Milliron had examined the type specimens of the species under consideration he would have seen that the nomenclature he proposed was incorrect. Type specimens of *T. picirostris, T. stephensi, T. tomentosus* and other species variously reported as synonyms have been examined (Clark, 1971). The pertinent synonymy is:

(a) for the species currently known as *T. stephensi* and *T. tomentosus*:
?*Curculio picirostris* Fabricius, 1787, p. 101, pars
Curculio tomentosus Herbst, 1795, p. 278 (non Olivier, 1790, p. 536)
Tychius stepheni Schönherr, 1836, p. 412
Tychius stephensi Schönherr (emendation by Stephens, 1839, p. 229)

(b) for the species currently known as *T. picirostris*:
Curculio cinerascens Marsham, 1802, p. 248
Tychius (*Miccotrogus*) *picirostris* (Fabricius), Schönherr, 1825, p. 583; 1826, p. 247; 1836, p. 422, all based on a misidentification.

4. The current concept of *T. picirostris* (Fabricius) as a species with six antennal funicular articles stems from assignment by Germar, 1824, and Schönherr, 1825, 1826, of *Rhynchaenus picirostris* 'var. b' Gyllenhal, 1813, *Ins. Suec.*, Coleopt. vol. 1 (3), p. 122 to genus-group taxa so characterised, followed by Schönherr's citation (1836, p. 422) of Fabricius, 1787, as authority for *Tychius (Miccotrogus) picirostris*. The name *picirostris* was first associated with *Tychius* and *Miccotrogus* when Schönherr, 1825, p. 583, established *Miccotrogus* as a subgenus of *Tychius* Germar. Schönherr designated *Curculio cuprifer* Panzer, [1799], *Ins. Germ.*, Heft 61, tab. 10 as type species of *Miccotrogus* and also referred to the genus *'Sibin. picirostris* Germ., Rhynch. id. var. Gyll.', cited in 1826, p. 247 as *'Rhynch. picirostris* var. Gyllenh. Ins. Sv.'. This 'var.' was not the *R. picirostris* of Gyllenhal, 1813, p. 121, which Gyllenhal attributed to Fabricius, 1801, p. 449, Paykull, 1800, p. 253 and Herbst, 1795, pp. 278, 446. Instead it was a 'var. b' which Gyllenhal, 1813, p. 122, apparently considered to be the same as *Curculio cinerascens* Marsham, 1802, *Entomol. Britt.*, vol. 1, p. 248; and according to R. T. Thompson (*British Museum* (*Natural History*)) the type of Marsham's species in that museum belongs to the species now known as *Tychius picirostris*. This 'var. b' was assigned by Germar, 1824, p. 291 to *Sibinia*, while Schönherr, 1825, p. 583 assigned the 'var. Gyll.' and (1826, p. 247) the 'var. Gyllenh. Ins. Sv.' to *Miccotrogus*. *Sibinia* Germar, 1824, p. 289 and *Miccotrogus* Schönherr, 1826, p. 247, were both characterised as having six antennal funicular articles, where-

as Schönherr, 1826, p. 245, described *Tychius* as having seven funicular articles. Thus it is clear that Germar and Schönherr considered Gyllenhal's *picirostris* 'var. b' to be a species with 6 instead of 7 funicular articles, although Gyllenhal made no reference to the antennal funiculus. It is also clear that Schönherr, 1825, 1826, considered Gyllenhal's 'var. b' to be a species distinct from Gyllenhal's *R. picirostris*. In 1825, p. 583, Schönherr listed *R. picirostris* 'var. Ghil. (sic)' in *Tychius* and the *R. picirostris* 'var. Gyll.' in *Miccotrogus*. In 1836, p. 411, he cited '*R. picirostris* alpha' with Germar, 1813 as author, as a synonym of *T. tomentosus*, while on p. 422 he placed the 'var. b' in his *T. (Miccotrogus) picirostris*. It is significant that Schönherr, 1825, 1826 and Germar, 1824, cited Gyllenhal instead of Fabricius as the author of *picirostris*. Later, however (1836, p. 422), by citing Fabricius as one of the authorities for *T. (Miccotrogus) picirostris*, Schönherr brought Fabricius' name into association with Gyllenhal's *picirostris* 'var. b', characterised as having six funicular articles. Subsequent authors have attributed the name *picirostris* to Fabricius, not to Gyllenhal.

5. In order to determine the identity of Gyllenhal's *R. picirostris* and his *R. picirostris* 'var. b' (1813, pp. 121–122), 46 specimens identified as *R. picirostris* from the Gyllenhal collection at Uppsala University, Sweden, were examined (Clark, 1971). According to Lars Hedstrom (in litt., 31 January 1970) two of these were from the 'Insecta Suecica collection' whereas 44 form the 'total representation of Gyllenhal's general collection'. The 44 were sent under a general label: *'Rhynchaenus picirostris* S. El. 2. 449. 55. Curc. id. Payk. S.3. 453. 73'. All 46 specimens are *T. stephensi* (with seven funicular articles). Later, 10 specimens, which Hedstrom (in litt., 12 May 1970) says 'were placed immediately below' the 44 specimens in Gyllenhal's general collection were examined (Clark, 1971). The legible portion of the label with these specimens reads: *'Tychius tomentosus* Sch. *picirostris* var. b Sch.'. Nine of these are *T. stephensi*, the tenth is *T. picirostris* (with six funicular articles). These labels must have been written after 1817, when *Tychius* was established, so there is some question as to whether they represent Gyllenhal's concept of his *picirostris* 'var. b'.

6. The citation of Fabricius, 1787, in association with *R. picirostris* 'var. b' under the name *Tychius (Miccotrogus) picirostris* by Schönherr, 1836, p. 422, appears to have been a mistake. As discussed above, both Schönherr, 1825, 1826 and Germar, 1824, considered 'var. b' to be a species with six funicular articles. It has since been discovered (see Clark, 1971) that *Curculio picirostris* Fabricius, 1787, p. 101, is represented by two specimens in the Zoologisk Museum, Copenhagen, one in Fabricius' own collection, the other in the collection of Sehested and Tønder Lund. In 1970 B. D. Valentine (*Ohio State University*) examined 'the type' of *C. picirostris* at Copenhagen and determined it as *T. stephensi* by comparison with specimens so identified by R. T. Thompson. Later, however, Thompson (in litt., 3 September 1975) questioned

Valentine's determination, noting that the original description of *C. picirostris* does not fit *T. stephensi*. Consequently, L. Dieckmann (*Akademie der Landwirtschaftwissenschaften, Eberswalde, DDR*) was asked to examine the 'type' of *C. picirostris*. He reported (in litt., 6 May 1976) that the specimen is actually a small female *Tychius quinquepunctatus* (Linnaeus). This was seen as a possible explanation of the discrepancy between Fabricius' original description of *C. picirostris* and the 'type' seen by Valentine. It also brought to mind Valentine's assertion that a specimen identified as *Rhynchaenus picirostris* at Copenhagen was 'a tychiine, but larger than *T. stephensi*' (Clark, 1971, p. 13). Dr Dieckmann was next asked to investigate the possibility that there are actually two specimens of *C. picirostris* in the Fabrician material. A second specimen sent to him from Copenhagen proved to belong to the species known to him as *T. tomentosus* (the *T. stephensi* of Thompson and Valentine).

7. Dieckmann's identification of the second Fabrician specimen explains Valentine's identification of 'the type' of *C. picirostris* as *T. stephensi* but leaves open the question of which of the two should be considered the holotype. The *T. quinquepunctatus* is in the Tønder Lund collection at Copenhagen, while the *T. stephensi* is in Fabricius' own collection, originally at Kiel, but now in Copenhagen (Zimsen, 1964). S. L. Tuxen (*Zoological Museum, Copenhagen*) offered the following comment on these two specimens (in litt., 11 January 1977): 'Fabricius, 1787, p. 101, states under *picirostris* "Hafniae Dom. Lund". When the specimen on which he (Fabricius) based his description was present in Tønder Lund's collection he wrote "Mus. Dom. Lund", meaning museum Domini Lundi. This he did not do here, and so the logical solution should be that Tønder Lund sent him a specimen (Valentine's *T. stephensi*) from Copenhagen ("Hafniae") for his collection; this was the reason for our showing this specimen to Valentine as the type. At the second request, 14 November 1975, almost six years later, I decided on the other possibility (having forgotten Valentine's visit), namely that Fabricius had forgotten to write "Mus." Dom. Lund.— which has happened in other cases — and sent the specimen (Dieckmann's *T. quinquepunctatus*) from the collection of Sehested and Tønder Lund.' For historical reasons, then, the *T. stephensi* in Fabricius' own collection seems most likely to have been the original *C. picirostris* of Fabricius, 1787, p. 101. The discrepancy between this specimen and the original description, however, remains unexplained.

8. The name *Curculio fuscirostris*, wrongly attributed to Paykull, 1792, p. 62, has also been listed as a synonym of *T. picirostris* (Schönherr, 1836, p. 422; Klima, 1934, p. 31; Hoffmann, 1954, p. 1203). Although there is some evidence that the specimen Paykull called *fuscirostris* in 1792 was actually *T. picirostris*, his use of the name was based on a misidentification of *C. fuscirostris* Fabricius, 1775 (now *Apion fuscirostre* (Fabricius), see Dieckmann, 1977, p. 58). The name cannot

therefore be attributed to him or used for either of the clover seed weevils (Clark, 1978).

9. Schönherr, 1836, p. 412, had no specimens before him when he named *T. stephensi* but merely renamed the species that Stephens, 1831, p. 56, had misidentified as *T. tomentosus* (Herbst) (Marshall, 1957; Clark, 1971). He repeated word for word Stephens' diagnosis of '*T. tomentosus*' and cited Stephens' *T. tomentosus* in synonymy, while stating in a footnote 'mihi invisus' (unseen by me). He spelt the name *'stepheni'*. Stephens, 1839, p. 229, emended the spelling to *stephensi*. Since Schönherr's intention to name the species after Stephens is obvious, his original spelling can be considered a lapsus calami, so that Stephens' spelling is a justified emendation. The lectotype of *T. stephensi*, a specimen under the name *T. tomentosus* in the Stephens Collection in the British Museum (Natural History) designated by Clark, 1971, p. 10, is conspecific with the lectotype of *T. tomentosus* (Herbst, non Olivier), also designated by Clark there.

10. The status of the type of *Curculio cinerascens* Marsham, 1802 must be clarified. According to R. T. Thompson, in litt. 12 February, 1982, 'The specimen is a female and is virtually complete apart from the damage caused by being impaled upon a relatively massive pin. In addition to the disc bearing the number 28, there is a label with the name *cinerascens* in an unknown hand (almost certainly not Stephens or Marsham). There are three other specimens in the series, but they are mounted on points'. It is known that when Marsham's collection was to be sold at auction, Stephens got access to it and made up 'a set' which he incorporated in his own collection. With these specimens are numbered discs, the numbers corresponding to those given to each species in Marsham's work. The remainder of Marsham's collection was dispersed by the sale and no trace of it survives. There is therefore no means of knowing how many specimens of any species Marsham had. In these circumstances I agree with Mr Thompson that the sound course is to assume that he had more than one and, in the present instance, to designate the female referred to above as lectotype of the species.

11. Regardless of which of the two Fabrician specimens in the Copenhagen Museum is eventually decided to be the holotype of *C. picirostris*, strict application of the Law of Priority dictates that the name of the species now known as *T. picirostris* (Fabricius) must be changed. If the specimen of *T. stephensi* turns out to be the holotype, it will be necessary to transfer the name *picirostris* from the clover seed weevil to the red clover seed weevil to replace the names *T. stephensi* and *T. tomentosus*. This would cause undue confusion. The use of the name *tomentosus* Herbst has no justification because of its status as a junior primary homonym. It is preferable that the name *stephensi* be conserved as the name for the red clover seed weevil. Stability of current nomenclature (except for *tomentosus*) can be preserved by ratifying the nomencla-

ture adopted by Milliron, 1949. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is therefore asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to set aside as type specimens of *Curculio picirostris* Fabricius, 1787, the two tychiine weevil specimens in the Fabricius and the Sehested and Tønder Lund collections at Copenhagen and designate as neotype of that species the female lectotype of *Curculio cinerascens* Marsham, 1802 in the British Museum (Natural History), which has six antennal funicular articles and belongs to the species currently known as *Tychius picirostris* (Fabricius, 1787). (*C. cinerascens* was described in a work devoted exclusively to British beetles; the type locality is therefore assumed to be 'Britain');

(2) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) the specific name *picirostris* Fabricius, 1787, as published in the binomen *Curculio picirostris*, and as interpreted by reference to the neotype designated under the plenary powers in (1) above;

(b) the specific name *stephensi* Schönherr, 1836, as published in the binomen *Tychius stepheni* (sic), as interpreted by reference to the lectotype designated by Clark, 1971, p. 10;

(3) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) the specific name *tomentosus* Herbst, 1795, as published in the binomen *Curculio tomentosus* (a junior primary homonym of *Curculio tomentosus* Olivier, 1790);

(b) *stepheni* Schönherr, 1836, as published in the binomen *Tychius stepheni* (an incorrect original spelling of *stephensi* Schönherr, 1836, in the same combination).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Several persons have assisted in various ways in the preparation of this proposal. Special thanks are extended to R. E. Warner, lately of the *USDA Systematic Entomology Laboratory, Washington, D.C.*, who made her notes on nomenclature of the clover seed weevils available to me. Those who read various drafts of the proposal and made suggestions for its improvement include *R. Caldara (*Milano, Italy*), L. Dieckmann (*Akademie der Landwirtschaftwissenschaften, Eberswalde, DDR*), *C. A. Johansen (*Washington State University, Pulman, WA*), *C. W. Sabrosky (*USDA Systematic Entomology Laboratory, Washington, D.C.*), *R. T. Thompson (*British Museum (Natural History), London*), S. L. Tuxen (*Zoologisk Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*), *B. D. Valentine (*Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio*), *D. R. Whitehead (USDA Systematic Entomology Laboratory, Washington, D.C.) and *E.C. Zimmerman

(*CSIRO, Canberra, Australia*). Those marked with an asterisk have signified their support.

REFERENCES

CLARK, W. E. 1971. A taxonomic revision of the weevil genus *Tychius* Germar in America north of Mexico. *Brigham Young Univ. Sci. Bull.*, vol. 13, no. 3, 39 pp.

——— 1976. Review of the genus-group taxa included in the genus *Tychius* Germar (Coleoptera: Curculionidae). *Entomol. Scand.* vol. 7, pp. 91–95.

——— 1978. The status of Paykull's *Curculio fuscirostris* (Coleoptera: Curculionidae). *Entomol. Scand.* vol. 9, pp. 239–240.

DIECKMANN, L. 1977. Beiträge zur Insektenfauna der DDR: Coleoptera–Curculionidae (Apioninae). *Beitr. Entomol.* vol. 27, pp. 7–114.

FABRICIUS, J. C. 1775. *Systema Entomologiae,* vol. 16, pt 1, 832 pp.

——— 1787. *Mantissa Insectorum,* vol. 1. Hafniae, 348 pp.

——— 1792. *Entomologia Systematica,* vol. 1, part 2. Hafniae, 538 pp.

——— 1801. *Systema Eleutheratorum,* vol. 2. Kiliae, 687 pp.

GERMAR, E. F. 1824. *Insectorum species novae ... volumen primum.* Coleoptera. Halae, xxiv+624 pp.

GYLLENHAL, L. 1813. *Insecta Suecica.* Classis 1, Coleoptera sive Eleutherata, vol. 1, para 3. Scaris, 730 pp.

HERBST, J. F. W. 1795 in HERBST, J. F. W., JABLONSKY, K. G. *Natursystem aller bekannten in- und auslandischen Insekten ... der Käfer,* VI. Berlin, xxiv+520 pp.

HOFFMANN, A. 1954. *Faune de France,* Coléoptères, Curculionides II, vol. 59, pp. 487–1208.

KLIMA, A. 1934. Curculionidae: subfamily Tychiinae. In Schenkling (ed.), *Coleopterorum Catalogus,* vol. 29, pars 138, pp. 1–69.

MARSHALL, G. A. K. 1957, cited in SLEEPER, E. L. Notes on the Curculionoidea. *Ohio J. Sci.*, vol. 57, pp. 38–42.

MARSHAM, T. 1802. *Entomologia Britannica* ... vol. 1, Coleoptera. London, (vii)–xxxi+547+(1) pp.

MILLIRON, H. E. 1949. The identity of two introduced clover seed weevils. (Coleoptera: Curculionidae). *J. New York entomol. Soc.,* vol. 57, pp. 109–116.

MUKA, A. A. 1954. (Summary of) The biology of the clover head weevil, *Tychius stephensi,* with some notes on control. *Dissert. Abstr.* vol. 15, pp. 12–23.

OLIVIER, A. G. 1790. *Encyclopédie Méthodique,* vol. 5, Insectes. Paris, 793 pp.

PAYKULL, G. VON 1792. *Monographia Curculionum Sueciae.* Uppsala, (i–viii)+151 (152) pp.

——— 1800. *Fauna Suecica,* Insecta (pars 3). Uppsala, 459 pp.

SCHÖNHERR, C. J. 1825. *Tabula synoptica familiae curculionidum. Isis* (Oken), vol. 5, pp. 581–588.

——— 1826. *Curculionidum Dispositio methodica.* Lipsiae, 338 pp.

——— 1836. *Genera et Species curculionidum,* vol. 3, part 1, Paris, 505 pp.

STEPHENS, J. F. 1831. *Illustrations of British Entomology* ... Mandibulata, vol. 4. London, 366 pp.

——— 1839. *A manual of British Coleoptera, or beetles.* London, xii + 443 pp.

YUNUS, C. M., JOHANSEN, C. A. 1967. Bionomics of the clover seed weevil, *Miccotrogus picirostris* (Fabricius) in southwestern Washington and adjacent Idaho. *Bull. Washington Agric. Exper. Sta.*, no. 53, 16 pp.

ZIMSEN, E. 1964. *The type material of J. C. Fabricius.* Copenhagen, 656 pp.

DAPSILARTHRA FOERSTER, 1862 (INSECTA, HYMENOPTERA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.)2312

By C. van Achterberg (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Ramsteeg 2, Leiden, The Netherlands*)

The name of a small Holarctic genus of the ALYSIINAE (BRACONIDAE), *Dapsilarthra* Foerster, 1862, is threatened by the usually incorrectly interpreted name *Gnamptodon* Haliday, 1833. To prevent confusion between two similar names (*Gnamptodon* and *Gnaptodon*) by the same author in one family, the suppression of the older of the two names is requested. *Dapsilarthra* is a rather small genus containing parasites of Dipterous larvae belonging to the AGROMYZIDAE, ANTHOMYIIDAE, TEPHRITIDAE, PSILIDAE and SCATOPHAGIDAE. *Gnaptodon* Haliday, 1837 is also a small genus belonging to the GNAPTODONTINAE (to the ROGADINAE, or to the OPIINAE according to some authors) within the BRACONIDAE. This genus is widespread, and contains parasites of leaf-mining Lepidopterous larvae of the NEPTICULIDAE.

2. *Gnamptodon* was proposed by Haliday (1833, p. 265) with *Bassus rufiventris* Nees, [1812] as the type species by monotypy. There is no doubt about the interpretation of *Bassus rufiventris* Nees, [1812], despite its type being lost. It belongs to the genus *Dapsilarthra* Foerster, 1862 as it is widely accepted.

3. In 1837 (p. 204) Haliday mentioned the name *Gnamptodon* as a synonym of the subgenus *Opius*. However, later in the same paper (p. 220) he used the name *Gnaptodon*, instead of *Gnamptodon*, as a subgenus of *Opius* and included only one species, namely *Bracon pumilio* Nees, 1834, which is a Braconid belonging to the GNAPTODONTINAE. By so doing he formally described a new genus *Gnaptodon* (Articles 12 and 16(a) (v)). The name *Gnaptodon* may be purely a misprint, as suggested by Hincks (1943, p. 103), because Haliday himself used *Gnamptodon* again in 1840 (p. 61), but this time with *Bracon pumilio* Nees, 1834 as type. However this designation cannot stand because of his previous 1833 designation. Unfortunately he did not give a reason for changing his 1833 concept of *Gnamptodon*. However, judging from the characters mentioned by Haliday in 1833, he probably discovered his obvious misidentification of *Bassus rufiventris* Nees, [1812]. He also did not state in his 1840 paper that *Gnaptodon* was a *'lapsus calami'* for *Gnamptodon*. It may well be that *Gnaptodon* is a *'lapsus'* for *Gnamptodon*, but it is not possible to prove the misprint, and the problem about the first type designation in 1833

by Haliday remains to be solved. Since its description the generic name *Gnamptodon* has never been used according to its original valid type designation.

4. Until 1951 *Gnamptodon* was used according to the type-species designation used by Haliday in 1837 for *Gnaptodon* (Shenefelt, 1975, p. 1123). In 1951 Muesebeck & Walkley (p. 153) restored the name *Gnaptodon* to bring the type species and the generic name into agreement. This treatment has generally been accepted since then as is shown by the list of citations given by Shenefelt (1975, p. 1123).

5. *Dapsilarthra* as proposed by Foerster in 1862 (p. 267), with *Alysia apii* Curtis, 1826 as type species by monotypy, is threatened by the (only incorrectly used) generic name *Gnamptodon* when the valid type designation by Haliday in 1833 is accepted.

6. If the Code is strictly applied the names *Gnamptodon* Haliday 1833 (type species *Bassus rufiventris* Nees, [1812]) and *Gnaptodon* Haliday, 1837 (type species *Bracon pumilio* Nees, 1834) should both be used. As both genera belong to the family BRACONIDAE (though they are placed in different, but comparatively closely related subfamilies) and as the spelling *Gnamptodon* has often been used in the past for *Gnaptodon* Haliday, 1837, combined with the uncertainty about the correct spelling of *Gnaptodon,* the retention of both names would give rise to a lot of confusion. This could be prevented by the substitution of the name *Dapsilarthra* for *Gnamptodon.* This solution is the more desirable as *Dapsilarthra* has been used consistently for the genus since 1862, viz., in at least 15 different publications by 11 different authors, whilst in the same period not a single author has used the name *Gnamptodon* for it (Shenefelt, 1974, p. 986).

7. To avoid the loss of such a long established and much used name as *Dapsilarthra* Foerster, 1862, because of the priority of *Gnamptodon* Haliday, 1833 nec auct., the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is therefore requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Gnamptodon* Haliday, 1833, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for the Law of Homonymy;

(2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:
   (a) *Dapsilarthra* Foerster, 1862 (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Alysia apii* Curtis, 1826;
   (b) *Gnaptodon* Haliday, 1837 (gender: masculine), type species, by monotypy, *Bracon pumilio* Nees, 1834;

(3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
   (a) *apii* Curtis, 1826, as published in the binomen *Alysia apii* (specific name of type species of *Dapsilarthra* Foerster, 1862);
   (b) *pumilio* Nees, 1834, as published in the binomen *Bracon pumilio* (specific name of type species of *Gnaptodon* Haliday, 1837);

(4) to place the generic name *Gnamptodon* Haliday, 1833, suppressed under (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

CURTIS, J. 1826. *Br. Entomol.* vol. 3, p. 141.

FOERSTER, A. 1862. Synopsis der Familien und Gattungen der Braconen. *Verh. naturh. Ver. preuss. Rheinl.* vol. 19, pp. 225–288.

HALIDAY, A. H. 1833. An essay on the classification of the parasitic Hymenoptera of Britain, which correspond with the Ichneumones minuti of Linnaeus. *Entomol. Mag.* vol. 1, pp. 259–276.

——— 1837. Essay on parasitic Hymenoptera. *Entomol. Mag.* vol. 4, pp. 203–221.

——— 1840. Braconides, pp. 61–65. In: Westwood, J. O. *An introduction to the modern classification of insects. Synopsis to the genera of British insects.* Volume 2. Longman, London, pp. 1–158.

HINCKS, W. D. 1943. Nomenclature notes on Braconidae and Aphidiidae (Hym.). *Entomologist* vol. 76, pp. 97–104.

MUESEBECK, C. F. W. & WALKLEY, L. M. 1951. Braconidae, pp. 90–184. In: Muesebeck, C. F. W., Krombein, K. V. & Townes, H. K. Hymenoptera of America north of Mexico/Synoptic Catalog. *Agriculture Monogr.* vol. 2, pp. 1–1420.

NEES von ESENBECK, C. G. D. [1812]. *Hymenopterorum Ichneumonibus Affinium Monogr.*, 1, pp. 90–91.

SHENEFELT, R. D. 1974. *Hymenopterorum Catalogus (nov. ed.). Part 11. Braconidae 7.* Junk, 's-Gravenhage, pp. 937–1113.

——— 1975. *Hymenopterorum Catalogus (nov. ed.). Part 12. Braconidae 8.* Junk, 's-Gravenhage, pp. 1115–1262.

ADIANTHUS BUCATUS AMEGHINO, 1891 (MAMMALIA): PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A NEOTYPE UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.)2430

By Richard L. Cifelli (*Department of Mammals, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C. 20560, U.S.A.* and Miguel F. Soria (H) *Departmento de Paleontologia (Vertebrados), Museo Argentino de Ciencas Naturales, Avenida Angel Gallardo 470, Buenos Aires 1405, Argentina*)

The concept of the genus *Adianthus* Ameghino, 1891 (*Rev. Argentina Hist. nat.* vol. 1, pp. 129–167; invalidly emended in later publications to '*Adiantus*'), type species *A. bucatus* Ameghino, 1891, has been a matter of dispute due to confusion regarding the type specimen. Ameghino's original description of this species (op. cit.) was based on a cheek tooth which he identified as a right upper molar. The specimen was lost or mislaid, evidently during Ameghino's lifetime as he made no further reference to it and it has not been found in the Ameghino collection, now housed at the Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales in Buenos Aires. No comparable materials have since come to light. The description and figure of this specimen (op. cit., fig. 31) are adequate, nonetheless, and *Adianthus bucatus* is therefore an available name. Revisory work in progress indicates that the specimen is, however, irrelevant to the entire group of ungulate mammals under consideration and belonged to a caviomorph rodent, probably a somewhat atypical dasyproctid or erethizontid. Unless a neotype is designated, new names will have to be proposed for the ADIANTHIDAE and its type-genus, *Adianthus*.

2. Ameghino later described (1894, *Bol. acad. Nac. Cien. Cordoba* vol. 13, pp. 259–452) and figured (1897, *Bol. inst. Geogr. Argentino* vol. 18, pp. 406–521, fig. 41) a hemimandible as pertaining to this species, and reference was made to this latter specimen, rather than to the type, in defining the ADIANTHIDAE (1894 op. cit.) and in placing in it other than new genera and species (1901, *Bol. acad. Nac. Cien. Córdoba*, vol. 16, pp. 349–426; 1904, *An. soc. Cien. Argentina* vol. 18, p. 56). This mandible, still in existence (Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales, Ameghino Collection no. 1812), was collected from a different locality and is probably but not certainly of a different geological age than the type. It unquestionably does not belong to the same species or even order as the type, but instead represents a distinct genus and species of ADIANTHIDAE as that family is currently conceived. Some subsequent workers have taken this referred specimen as the type or neotype of *Adianthus bucatus* (Scott, 1910, *Repts. Princeton Univ.*

Exped. Patagonia vol. 7(1), pp. 1–156; Soria, 1981, *Rev. Mus. Argentino Cien. nat.* vol. 3, pp. 1–54). On the other hand, other students have used Ameghino's figure of the type as a basis for comparison when erecting new taxa pertaining to the family and assessing phylogenetic relationships of and within the group (Patterson, 1940, *Geol. ser. Field Mus. nat. Hist.* vol. 8, pp. 13–20; Simpson & Minoprio, 1949, *Am. Mus. Novitates* 1434, pp. 1–27).

3. Although the type specimen has probably been lost, the figure and descriptions of it are adequate. The referred mandible cannot be designated neotype by unilateral action as the type is probably diagnostic and specifically identifiable. It is likely that additional materials pertaining to this species will be recovered when the fauna from which it is derived is better known.

4. These confusing circumstances could be alleviated either by the designation of new generic and specific names for the mandible and designation of another genus as family type, or by designation by the Commission of the referred specimen as neotype. As the referred specimen clearly represents a distinct genus belonging to the group in question and as the ADIANTHIDAE is a name established and used in the literature for nearly 100 years (Ameghino, 1894, op. cit.; Loomis, 1914, The Deseado Formation of Patagonia; Simpson *et al.*, 1962, op. cit.; Soria, 1981, op. cit.; Quiroga, 1981, *Ameghiniana* vol. 18, pp. 67–71; Bond & Vucetich, 1983, *Rev. Assoc. Geol. Arg.* vol. 37 (in press)), this latter course is preferable in the interest of nomenclatural stability.

5. The Commission is therefore requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to set aside the type series of *Adianthus bucatus* Ameghino, 1891, and having done so to designate the hemimandible M.A.C.N. no. A1812, described and figured by Ameghino (1894, op. cit.; 1897, op. cit.) as neotype of that species;

(2) to place the generic name *Adianthus* Ameghino, 1891 (op. cit., p. 134) (gender: masculine), type species, by monotypy, *Adianthus bucatus* Ameghino, 1891 (ibid.) on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *bucatus* Ameghino, 1891, as published in the binomen *Adianthus bucatus* (specific name of type species of *Adianthus* Ameghino, 1891), as interpreted by the neotype designated under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the family name ADIANTHIDAE Ameghino, 1891 (type genus *Adianthus Ameghino,* 1891) on the Official List of Family Names in Zoology.

STATUS OF THE NAMES *CALLIONYMUS SAGITTA* PALLAS, 1770 AND *CALLIONYMUS FILAMENTOSUS* VALENCIENNES, 1837 (TELEOSTEI, CALLIONYMIDAE), AND REQUEST TO MAKE AN EXCEPTION FROM ARTICLE 75c (4) and (5) FOR DESIGNATING A NEOTYPE FOR *CALLIONYMUS SAGITTA* PALLAS, 1770. Z.N.(S.)2435

By Ronald Fricke (*Staatliches Naturhistorisches Museum, Pockelsstr. 10A D-3300 Braunschweig, Federal Republic of Germany)*

Callionymus sagitta Pallas, 1770 was originally described from a specimen from Amboina (E. Indonesia). The species was inadequately described, but an illustration was given by Pallas, from which we can see most of the important characters.

2. The holotype and only specimen of *Callionymus sagitta* (sensu Pallas) seems to be lost. Dr A. P. Andriashev (Acad. Sci. U.S.S.R., Leningrad, personal communication) and Dr N. V. Parin (Oceanogr. Inst., Moscow, personal communication) informed me that the type material of Pallas was transferred to Germany at the end of the 18th century by Pallas himself, and that the holotype of *C. sagitta* is not available in the Soviet fish collections. The large German museums were checked (e.g. ZMB, East Berlin; ZIM, Hamburg; SMF, Frankfurt/Main), as were other European and non-European museum and university collections, but it was not possible to locate the specimen. Dr H.-J. Paepke (ZMB, East Berlin) informed me that the material was probably in his institution but may have been lost during the Napoleonic occupation in the early 19th century, or during World War II when parts of the collection were destroyed. Therefore it is most probable that the holotype of *C. sagitta* is lost.

3. Subsequently, many authors have used the name *Callionymus sagitta* for specimens distributed in areas between India and Java (W. Indonesia), the Gulf of Thailand, and China. At least 50 authors have used the name *C. sagitta,* as it is a common species (e.g. Valenciennes, 1837; Günther, 1861; Day, 1875–1878; Weber, 1913; Beaufort & Chapman, 1951; Smith, 1963; Nakabo, 1982; Fricke, 1982; Fricke, 1983).

4. One junior synonym is available for *C. sagitta: Calionymus serratospinosus* Gray, 1835, which has never been used again in the literature. *Callionymus serratospinosus* was originally not described, but only illustrated with a colour drawing, from which we can see that it mostly agrees in its characters with other Indian material known under the name *C. sagitta.* There is no type available for *C. serratospinosus,* and according to information of Dr P. J. P. Whitehead and Mr A. C. Wheeler (BM(NH) London, personal communication), a type specimen was never deposited in any museum, and Gray knew the fish only from the drawing which was sent by General Hardwicke from India.

5. No other junior synonyms are available for *Callionymus sagitta* (sensu Valenciennes, 1837; populations distributed between India and China).

6. *Callionymus filamentosus* Valenciennes, 1837 was originally described from two specimens from Manado, N. Celebes. These syntypes are still available (MNHN Paris A1556), and in good condition. The name *C. filamentosus* (a common and widely distributed species) has been used by at least 60 authors (e.g. Valenciennes, 1837; Günther, 1861; Bleeker, 1879; Norman, 1929; Ninni, 1934; Beaufort & Chapman, 1951; Smith, 1963; Wheeler, 1973; Nakabo, 1982; Fricke, 1982; Fricke, 1983).

7. Examining the drawing of *Callionymus sagitta* published by Pallas, 1770, it can be considered evident that the specimen illustrated (the holotype) is not conspecific with other material sensu Valenciennes *et al.* from India and China. The specimen in the drawing differs in:

— the shape of the preopercular spine;
— the medial caudal fin filament;
— the structure of the occipital region;
— the preorbital length;
— the colour pattern of the first dorsal fin, the second dorsal fin, and the body.

The holotype of *C. sagitta* agrees, however, in all these features with male specimens of *Callionymus filamentosus* and should be treated as conspecific with that species.

8. According to Art. 23e (ii) of the International Code, *Callionymus sagitta* Pallas, 1770 would therefore be a senior synonym of *Callionymus filamentosus* Valenciennes, 1837. Furthermore, *Callionymus sagitta* from India to China (sensu Valenciennes *et al.*) would need a new name (since the only junior synonym, *C. serratospinosus* Gray, 1835 is not useful and perhaps not even identical with *C. sagitta* sensu Valenciennes. *C. sagitta* sensu Valenciennes would also need a type specimen.

9. If we treated *Callionymus sagitta* as a senior synonym of *Callionymus filamentosus,* this would be very bad for the stability of nomenclature in the Callionymidae:

— the well-adapted name *Callionymus filamentosus* would have to be changed into *Callionymus sagitta*;
— the well-adapted name *Callionymus sagitta* sensu Valenciennes would have to be changed into a new name;
— a neotype for *Callionymus sagitta* (syn.: *C. filamentosus*) would be necessary.
— a new type for the newly named species cited as *C. sagitta* sensu Valenciennes would be necessary.

10. I suggest an easier way which is much better for the stability of nomenclature: to continue to use the name *Callionymus sagitta* Pallas, 1770 for populations of *C. sagitta* sensu Valenciennes distri-

buted from India to China, but not for the species described in the original description (*C. filamentosus*), and to use the name *Callionymus filamentosus* Valenciennes, 1837 as valid as usual (as an exception from the rule of priority, according to Art. 23a of the International Code). I request a statement of the International Commission regarding the use of these two names.

11. If the International Commission follows my suggestion, we only need a neotype for *Callionymus sagitta* to clarify the identity of this name. I hereby propose the specimen of *C. sagitta* whose data follow, deposited in the California Academy of Sciences, Stanford University Collection, San Francisco, No. CAS–SU 41392, as neotype. (*Callionymus sagitta* Pallas, 1770, female, 86·1 mm SL, INDIA: mouth of River Hooghli, Sundarbans, Bengal Province, ca 21°50′N 88°00′E, S.W. Kemp, 1911.).

12. For designating this neotype, a decision of the International Commission would be necessary to make an exception from Art. 75c of the International Code ("Qualifying conditions for the designation of neotypes"). An exception would be necessary for the following two reasons:

(a) There can be no evidence that the neotype is consistent with what is known from the original type material, since this type material most probably had belonged to a different species (*Callionymus filamentosus*).

(b) The neotype cannot come from the original type locality, since the species apparently does not occur there.

In the case of rediscovery of the original Pallas holotype, it will become necessary to refer back to the Commission.

13. The Commission is accordingly requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to rule that the nominal species *C. sagitta* is to be interpreted by reference to the neotype designated in paragraph 11;

(2) to place the specific name *sagitta* Pallas, 1770, as published in the binomen *Callionymus sagitta* (as interpreted by reference to the neotype proposed in paragraph 11) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *filamentosus* Valenciennes, 1837, as published in the binomen *Callionymus filamentosus* Valenciennes, 1837, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

BEAUFORT, L. F. DE & CHAPMAN, W. M. 1951. In: WEBER, M. & BEAUFORT, L. F. DE *The fishes of the Indo-Australian Archipelago*, 9: Percomorphi (concluded), Blennioidea. Leiden.

BLEEKER, P. 1879. Révision des espèces insulindiennes de la famille des Callionymoides. *Versl. Meded. Koninkl. Akad. Wet. Amsterdam*, (2) vol. 14, pp. 79–107.

DAY, F. 1875–1878. *The fishes of India; being a natural history of the fishes known to inhabit the seas and freshwaters of India, Burma, and Ceylon.* London

FRICKE, R. 1982. Nominal genera and species of dragonets (Teleostei: Callionymidae, Draconettidae). *Ann. Mus. Civ. Stor. Nat. Genova*, vol. 84, pp. 53–92.

FRICKE, R. 1983. *Revision of the Indo-Pacific genera and species of the dragonet family Callionymidae (Teleostei).* Braunschweig.

GRAY, J. E. 1835. *Illustrations of Indian Zoology; chiefly selected from the collections of Major-General Hardwicke, F.R.S.*, vol. 2, London.

GÜNTHER, A. 1861. *Catalogue of the fishes in the British Museum*, vol. 3, London.

NAKABO, T. 1982. Revision of genera of the dragonets (Pisces: Callionymidae). *Publ. Seto Mar. Biol. Lab.*, 27(1–3), 1982 pp. 77–131, figs. 1–30, tabs. 1–2.

NINNI, E. 1934. I Callionymus dei mari d'Europa. *Notas y Resumenes, Inst. Esp. Oceanogr. Madrid*, (2) vol. 85, pp. 1–59, pls. 1–13.

NORMAN, J. R. 1929. Notes on fishes of the Suez Canal. *Proc. Zool. Soc. London*, pp. 615–616.

PALLAS, P. S. 1770. *Spicilegia zoologica*, vol. 1, fasc. 8. Petropolis.

SMITH, J. L. B. 1963. Fishes of the families Draconettidae and Callionymidae from the Red Sea and Western Indian Ocean. *Rhodes University, Ichthyol. Bull.* vol. 28, pp. 547–564, figs. 1–8, pls. 83–86.

VALENCIENNES, A. 1837. Les Callionymes. In: Cuvier, G. & Valenciennes, A. *Histoire naturelle des poissons* vol. 12, Paris.

WEBER, M. 1913. *Die Fische der Siboga-Expedition.* Leiden.

WHEELER, A. 1973. Family Callionymidae. In: CLOFNAM (*Checklist of the fishes of the northeastern Atlantic and Mediterranean*), vol. 1. Paris.

PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *SIPHONOSOMA CUMANENSE* KEFERSTEIN, 1867 OVER *SIPHONOSOMA EDULE* (PALLAS, 1774) (SIPUNCULA). Z.N.(S.)2379

By Edward B. Cutler (*Biology Department, Utica College of Syracuse University, Utica, New York,* 13502 U.S.A.)

I am hereby requesting that the Commission use its plenary powers and adopt the relative precedence procedure to conserve the widely used junior synonym *Siphonosoma cumanense* Keferstein, 1867, over the senior synonym *S. edule,* in order to avoid confusion and to preserve nomenclatural stability. This latter species was first described as *Lumbricus edulis* by Pallas in 1774. In 1816 Lamarck moved it to the genus *Sipunculus* and in 1912, when Spengel created the genus *Siphonosoma,* it was transferred to that group.

2. During my studies of Indo-Pacific Sipuncula, it became clear that the genus *Siphonosoma* has been unduly inflated with an excessive number of species names. Stephen & Edmonds (1972) reduced the number of species in the sub-genus *Siphonosoma (Dasmosiphon)* from six to three. In Cutler & Cutler (1979) an additional name was eliminated and in Cutler, Cutler & Nishikawa (1983) the case is presented to consider *Siphonosoma cumanense* and *S. edule* as conspecific, following the suggestion of Stephen & Edmonds (1972). A strict application of the Law of Priority would require that *S. cumanense* be submerged as the junior synonym. This would be unfortunate for the following reasons:

(a) Since 1905, the name *S. edule* has appeared only twice in the primary literature. Sato (1939) applied it to two individuals and Halder (1975) to one worm. The few other references to it have been made in revisionary or monographic works, not in studies of new material.

(b) The name *cumanense* has appeared at least 30 times in the primary literature since 1905 (see Stephen & Edmonds, 1972, p. 46 for records through 1965; also Christie & Cutler, 1974; Cutler, 1977; Cutler & Cutler, 1979; Edmonds, 1980; Gibbs, 1978; Halder, 1975; Murina, 1967; Rice & Stephen, 1970).

(c) In Stephen & Edmonds' monograph (1972) there are five subspecies of *cumanense* described in addition to the nominate form which, in that work, includes four junior synonyms. All of these would become *S. edule* unless this petition is granted.

(d) The holotype of *S. edule* cannot be located.

(e) Perhaps most importantly, this species is a very common, circumtropical, shallow-water form and therefore is regularly found by biologists engaged in ecological studies of coral reef and sandy habitats. To substitute the name *edule* for *cumanense* would create real and unnecessary confusion for these non-specialists and besides, any effort to make the substitution could not be successful for several decades

because many marine ecologists would continue to use the old terminology.

3. In view of the foregoing, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked to take the following action:

(1) to use its plenary powers to rule that the specific name *cumanense* Keferstein, 1867, as published in the binomen *Siphonosoma cumanense,* is to be given nomenclatural precedence over the specific name *edule,* as originally published in the binomen *Lumbricus edulis* Pallas 1774, by anyone who considers that these two names denote the same taxon;

(2) to place the following names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) *cumanense* Keferstein, 1867, as published in the binomen *Siphonosoma cumanense,* with an endorsement that it is to be given nomenclatural precedence over *Siphonosoma edulis* Pallas, 1774, by anyone who considers that these two names denote the same taxon;

(b) *edulis* Pallas, 1774, as originally published in the binomen *Lumbricus edulis,* with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over *Siphonosoma cumanense* Keferstein, 1867, by anyone who considers that these two names denote the same taxon.

This application has been reviewed by and is supported by T. Nishikawa (Nagoya, Japan), P. E. Gibbs (Plymouth, England), and S. J. Edmonds (Adelaide, Australia).

REFERENCES

CHRISTIE, N. D. & CUTLER, E. B. 1974. New distribution records for two species of *Siphonosoma* (Sipuncula) collected using a diver-operated suction sampler. *Trans. roy. Soc. South Africa,* vol. 41, pp. 109–110.

CUTLER, E. B. 1977. The bathyal and abyssal Sipuncula. *Galathea Rep.,* vol. 14, pp. 135–156.

——— & CUTLER, N. J. 1979. Madagascar and Indian Ocean Sipuncula. *Bull. Mus. natn. Hist. nat.,* Paris 4e ser., vol. 1, pp. 941–990.

———, ——— & NISHIKAWA, T. 1983. *Siphonosoma cumanense* and *S. edule* (Sipuncula): a revaluation of their separate status. *Publ. of the Seto Marine Biol. Lab.,* vol. 27, (4/6), pp. 265–267.

EDMONDS, S. J. 1980. A revision of the systematics of Australian sipunculans (Sipuncula). *Records S. Australian Mus.,* vol. 18(1), pp. 1–74.

GIBBS, P. E. 1978. Macrofauna of the intertidal sand flats on low wooded islands, northern Great Barrier Reef. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. London B,* vol. 284, pp. 81–94.

HALDER, B. P. 1975. Sipuncula of the Indian Ocean in the collection of the zoological survey of India. *In:* Rice, M. E. & Todorovic, M. (Eds.). *Proc. internat. Symp. Biol.,* Sipuncula and Eciura, vol. 1, pp. 51–92.

KEFERSTEIN, W. 1867. Untersuchungen uber einige amerikanische Sipunculiden. *Zeit. Wiss. Zool.,* vol. 17, pp. 53–54, pl. 6, fig. 19–24.

LAMARCK, J. P. B. A. de M. 1816. *Histoire naturelle des animaux sans vertèbres,* vol. 3, pp. 76–79.

MURINA, V. V. 1967. Report on the sipunculid worms from the sublittoral zone of Cuba and Mexico Gulf. *Zool. Zhur.*, vol. 54, (9), 1329–1339.

PALLAS, P. S. 1774. *Lumbricus. Spicilegia Zoologica,* vol. 10, pp. 10–12, pl. 1, fig. 7.

RICE, M. E. & STEPHEN, A. C. 1970. The type specimens of Sipuncula and Echiura described by J. E. Gray and W. Baird in the collections of the British Museum (Natural History). *Bull. Brit. Mus. (Nat. Hist.)* (Zool), vol. 20 (2), pp. 49–72.

SATO, H. 1939. Studies on the Echiuridae, Sipunculids, and Priapulids of Japan. *Sci. Rep. Tohoku Imp. Univ.* 4th ser., vol. 14 (4), pp. 339–459.

SPENGEL, L. W. 1912. Einige Organisationsverhältnisse von Sipunculusarten und ihre Bedeutung für die Systematik dieser Tiere. *Verh. deutsch. zool. Ges.* (22 sten Jahresversammling zu Halle); pp. 261–272.

STEPHEN, A. C. & EDMONDS, S. J. 1972. The phyla Sipuncula and Echiura. *Trustees of Brit. Mus. (Nat. Hist.),* London, 528 pp.

PELLONULA BAHIENSIS STEINDACHNER, 1879 (PISCES): PROPOSED REPLACEMENT OF LECTOTYPE. Z.N.(S.)2445

By Peter J. P. Whitehead (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) and Gareth Nelson (*American Museum of Natural History, Central Park West at 79th St, New York, N.Y. 10024, U.S.A.*)

Whitehead, 1979, *Bull. br. Mus. (nat. Hist.)* (Zool.), vol. 20 (1), p. 14, designated as lectotype of *Pellonula bahiensis* Steindachner, 1879, *Sitzber. k. Akad. Wiss. Wien,* vol. 80, p. 181, pl. 3, fig. 2, the specimen in the Naturhistorisches Museum of Vienna NMV.2870 (69·1 mm SL) and as paralectotype the second specimen under this registration number (70·5 mm SL). The species was identified as *Rhinosardinia bahiensis* (Steindachner, 1879).

2. These two specimens were placed in the genus *Rhinosardinia* Eigenmann, 1912, *Mem. Carnegie Mus.* vol. 5, p. 445, type species, by original designation, *Rhinosardinia serrata* Eigenmann, *ibid.*, which was defined as having a retrorse spine on the maxilla (still the major diagnostic character). Whitehead, *loc. cit.*, assumed that the spine was broken off in the lectotype.

3. Steindachner had eight syntypes (to 100 mm SL). Since publication of Whitehead's lectotype designation based on an examination of two of these, another four syntypes have come to light (NMV. 76436:1–4). In fact, the six presently known syntypes include representatives of two species of two different genera, *Rhinosardinia bahiensis* (Steindachner) and *Lile piquitinga* (Schreiner & Ribeiro, 1903) (no retrorse spine on maxilla; very distinct silver lateral stripe down flanks; pre-dorsal bones 8–9 as compared with 11–13 in *R. bahiensis*; pelvic fin insertion behind vertical from dorsal fin origin as compared with distinctly in front in *R. bahiensis*). The six syntypes can now be identified as follows:

R. bahiensis: NMV. 76436:1 and 4

L. piquitinga: NMV. 2870:1 and 2 (previously designated lectotype and paralectotype respectively), 76436:2 and 3.

4. Steindachner's description is reasonably detailed, although many of the features are shared by *Rhinosardinia* and *Lile*. He clearly notes the retrorse maxillary spine of *Rhinosardinia* ('Ein ziemlich grosser, mit der Spitze nach hinten gekehrter Stachel am oberen Ende des kahnförmig gebogenen Oberkiefers'). On the other hand, he describes the silver lateral stripe of *Lile* ('Die silbergraue Seitenbinde am Rumpfe nimmt gegen den Schwanzstiel bald an Höhe ein wenig ab, bald zu'). His description of the pelvic fin insertion is equivocal ('bald ein wenig vor, bald unbedeutend hinter'). That his description was based

on both species is further borne out by his figure, which shows both the retrorse spine and the distinct silver lateral stripe, while the pelvic fin insertion is exactly beneath the dorsal fin origin.

5. As first taxonomic reviser, Whitehead (*loc. cit.*) clearly intended to recognise Steindachner's *bahiensis* as a species of *Rhinosardinia.* We propose that this intention be followed by replacing Whitehead's lectotype. If the original designation was to remain, the name *bahiensis* would become a senior synonym of *piquitinga* Schreiner & Ribeiro, 1903, a name well entrenched in the literature; and the name *bahiensis,* equally well entrenched in the literature as that of a valid species of *Rhinosardinia,* would have to be replaced by a new name. In view of Steindachner's confusion and the nomenclatural consequences we ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:

(1) to use its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type specimen hitherto made for the nominal species *Pellonula bahiensis* Steindachner, 1879, and to designate NMV. 76436:4 (a fish of 76·5 mm SL, 'Bucht von Bahia, Steindachner coll.) as lectotype of that species;

(2) to place the specific name *bahiensis* Steindachner, 1879, as published in the binomen *Pellonula bahiensis*, and as interpreted by reference to the lectotype designated under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

Adianthus bucatus Ameghino, 1891 (Mammalia). R. L. Cifelli & M. F. Soria 56
Status of the names *Callionymus sagitta* Pallas, 1770 and *Callionymus filamentosus* Valenciennes, 1837 (Teleostei, Callionymidae). R. Fricke 58
Proposed conservation of *Siphonosoma cumanense* Keferstein, 1867 over *Siphonosoma edule* (Pallas, 1774) (Sipuncula). E. B. Cutler 62
Pellonula bahiensis Steindachner, 1879 (Pisces). P. J. P. Whitehead & G. Nelson 65

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature wishes to express its appreciation of the facilities provided by the Trustees of the British Museum (Natural History) for the Secretariat of the Commission.

CONTENTS

	Page
Officers and Members of the Commission	i
Members of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature	ii
Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology	1
Special Announcements	2
Contacts with representative organisations; R. V. Melville	3
Comments	
Cardium californiense Deshayes, 1839 (Mollusca, Cardiidae). D. Heppell & R. V. Melville	5
Opinions	
Opinion 1264. *Oscinis plumigera* Loew, 1860 (Insecta, Diptera)	8
Opinion 1265. *Bellota* Peckham & Peckham, 1892 (Araneae, Salticidae)	10
Opinion 1266. *Cophixalus* Boettger, 1892 (Amphibia, Salientia)	12
Opinion 1267. *Muscicapa ruficauda* Swainson, 1838 (Aves, Muscicapidae)	15
Opinion 1268. *Simia leucophaea* F. Cuvier, 1807 (Mammalia, Primates)	17
Opinion 1269. *METRIDIIDAE* Carlgren, 1893 (Anthozoa) and *METRIDIIDAE* Sars, 1902 (Copepoda)	19
Opinion 1270. *Chrysomela flavicornis* and *C. tibialis* Suffrian, 1851 (Insecta, Coleoptera)	22
Opinion 1271. *Polynoe* Savigny, 1818 (Annelida, Polychaeta)	24
Opinion 1272. *Sciaena nibe* Jordan & Thompson, 1911 (Pisces)	26
Opinion 1273. *Anaspis. Luperus. Lampyris* and *Clerus* (Insecta, Coleoptera)	28
Opinion 1274. *Notonecta striata* Linnaeus, 1758 (Insecta, Hemiptera)	32
Opinion 1275. *Macrocephalites* Zittel, 1884 and *Ammonites macrocephalus* Schlotheim, 1813 (Mollusca, Cephalopoda)	34
Opinion 1276. *Semblis marginata* Panzer, 1799 (Insecta, Plecoptera)	36
Direction 114. Herrera, 1899, 'Sinonimia vulgar y cientifica de los principales vertebrados mexicanos'	39
Direction 115. *MEROPIDAE* (Aves): attributed to Rafinesque, 1815	41
New and revived cases	
Heliconius erato Aurivillius, 1882 (Insecta, Lepidoptera). J. R. G. Turner	43
Curculio picirostris Fabricius, 1787 and *Tychius stephensi* Schönherr, 1836 (Coleoptera, Curculionidae). W. E. Clark	45
Dapsilarthra Foerster, 1862 (Insecta, Hymenoptera). C. van Achterberg	53

Printed in Great Britain by Henry Ling Ltd., at the Dorset Press, Dorchester, Dorset

2702

29 June 1984 Volume 41 Part 2
pp. iii–iv, 67–128

ISSN 0007-5167

The Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature

The Official Organ of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

BRITISH MUSEUM
(NATURAL HISTORY)
13 JUL 1984
PURCHASED
ZOOLOGY LIBRARY

CENTRAL SALES,
COMMONWEALTH AGRICULTURAL BUREAUX,
FARNHAM ROYAL, SLOUGH SL2 3BN, UK.

[Note: Prices are subject to change without notice]

© *International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature 1984*, All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronically, mechanically, by photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
c/o British Museum (Natural History)
Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD

Price £10.50 (All rights reserved).

BRITISH MUSEUM (NATURAL HISTORY)
13 JUL 1984
PURCHASED
ZOOLOGY LIBRARY

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

President: Dr. W.D.L. RIDE *(School of Applied Science, Canberra College of Advanced Education, P.O. Box 1, Belconnen, A.C.T. 2616, Australia).*

Vice-President: Prof. Per BRINCK *(Ecology Building, University of Lund, S-223 62, Lund, Sweden).*

Secretary: Mr. R.V. MELVILLE *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD).*

B. The Members of the Commission

(Arranged in order of election or of most recent re-election)

Prof. Per BRINCK *(Ecology Building, University of Lund, S-223 62, Lund, Sweden)* (30 September 1972) *(Vice-President)* **Arthropoda; Ecology**

Prof. Dr. Raphael ALVARADO *(Departamento de Zoologia, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Madrid, Madrid 3, Spain)* (30 September 1972) **Echinoidea; Asteroidea**

Prof. E. BINDER *(Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle, CH 1211 Geneva 6, Switzerland)* (30 September 1972) **Mollusca**

Dr. L.B. HOLTHUIS *(Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands)* (30 September 1972) *(Councillor)* **Crustacea**

Dr. G. BERNARDI *(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005, Paris, France)* (30 September 1972) *(Councillor)* **Lepidoptera**

Prof. C. DUPUIS *(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005, Paris, France)* (30 September 1972) **Heteroptera**

Dr. M. MROCZKOWSKI *(Instytut Zoologiczny, Polska Akademia Nauk, ul. Wilcza 64, Warsaw, Poland)* (14 March 1975) **Coleoptera**

Prof. Dr. Otto KRAUS *(Zoologisches Institut und Zoologisches Museum, 2000 Hamburg 13, Germany)* (29 September 1976) **Arachnida, Myriapoda**

Dr. W.D.L. RIDE *(School of Applied Science, Canberra College of Advanced Education, P.O. Box 1, Belconnen, A.C.T. 2616, Australia)* (29 September 1976) *(President)* **Mammalia: Recent and Fossil**

Dr. Curtis W. SABROSKY *(Systematic Entomology Lab., USDA c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.)* (29 September 1976) *(Councillor)* **Diptera**

Dr. H.G. COGGER *(Australian Museum, Sydney 2000, N.S.W. Australia)* (29 September 1976) **Reptilia; E D P Methods**

Prof. Dr. Gerhard HAHN *(Fachbereich Geowissenschaften, Universitätsgebiet Lahnberge, 3550 Marburg, BRD)* (27 December 1978) **Palaeontology**

Prof. Dr. O. HALVORSEN *(Institute of Biology and Geology, University of Tromsö, P.O. Box 790, N-9001 Tromsö, Norway)* (27 December 1978) **Parasitology**

Dr. V.A. TRJAPITZIN, *(Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad B-164, USSR)* (27 December 1978) **Entomology**

Dr. F.M. BAYER *(U.S. National Museum of Natural History, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.)* (23 August 1979) *(Councillor)* **Octocorallia; Systematics**

Prof. John O. CORLISS *(University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, U.S.A.)* (23 August 1979) **Protozoa; Systematics**

Mr. R.V. MELVILLE *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD)* (23 August 1979) *(Secretary)* **Palaeontology**

Dr. Y.I. STAROBOGATOV *(Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad 199164, U.S.S.R.)* (23 August 1979) **Mollusca, Crustacea**

Dr. P.T. LEHTINEN, *(Zoological Museum, Department of Biology, University of Turku, SF-20500 Turku 50, Finland)* (8 August 1980) **Arachnida**

Dr. L.R.M. COCKS *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London, SW7 5BD)* (26 August 1982) **Brachiopoda**

Mr. David HEPPELL *(Department of Natural History, Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh EH1 1JF, Scotland)* (26 August 1982) *(Councillor)* **Mollusca**

Prof. Jay M. SAVAGE *(Department of Biology, University of Miami, P.O. Box 249118, Coral Gables, Florida 33124, U.S.A.)* (26 August 1982) **Herpetology**

Prof. R. SCHUSTER *(Institut für Zoologie, Universität Graz, Universitätsplatz 2, A–8010 Graz, Austria)* (26 August 1982) **Acari**

Dr. SHUN-ICHI UENO *(Department of Zoology, National Science Museum, Hyakunincho 3-23-1, Shinjukuku, Tokyo 160, Japan)* (26 August 1982) **Entomology**

Prof. A. WILLINK *(Universidad Nacional de Tucumán, Instituto Miguel Lillo, Miguel Lillo 205, 4000 Tucumán, Argentina)* (26 August 1982) **Neotropical Hymenoptera**

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Members of the Trust

Professor H.B. Whittington, F.R.S. *(Chairman)*
Dr. F.G.W. Jones *(Secretary and Managing Director)*
Prof. Per Brinck
Prof. J.H. Callomon, F.R.S.C.
Prof. C.B. Cox, F.G.S.
Prof. D. Curry, F.G.S.
The Rt. Hon. the Earl of Cranbrook, F.L.S., F.Z.S.
Sir Arthur Drew, K.C.B.
Sir Charles Fleming, K.B.E., F.R.S.
Prof. J. Forest
Col. Francis J. Griffin, O.B.E.
Dr. G.C. Gruchy
Dr. R.H. Hedley, F.I.Biol.
Dr. L.B. Holthuis
Sir Peter Kent, F.R.S.
Prof. Dr. O. Kraus
Dr. M. Luc
Dr. I.W.B. Nye
Dr. E.P.F. Rose, T.D.
Dr. W.D.L. Ride *(ex officio)*
Sir Eric Smith, F.R.S.
Dr. G.B. White
Prof. J.M. Dodd, F.R.S. *(Observer for the Royal Society)*

B. The Officers of the Trust

Mr. R.V. Melville, M.Sc. *(Scientific Controller)*
Mr. M.E. Tollett, M.Sc., F.L.S., F.R.E.S.
Mr. J.D.D. Smith, F.G.S. *(Administrator)*

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 41, part 2 (pp. iii–iv, 67–128) 29 June 1984

NOTICES

(a) *Date of commencement of voting.* In normal circumstances the Commission may start to vote on applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* six months after the publication of each application. Any zoologist who wishes to comment on any of the applications in the present part is invited to send his contribution, in duplicate, to the Secretariat of the Commission as quickly as possible, and in any case in time to reach the Secretariat before the close of the six-month period.

(b) *Possible use of the plenary powers.* The possible use by the Commission of its plenary powers is involved in the following applications published in the present part of the *Bulletin* (any marked with an asterisk involve the application of Articles 23a–b and 79b):

(1) *Zygaena anthyllidis* Boisduval, [1828] (Insecta, Lepidoptera): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2442. C.M. Naumann & W.G. Tremewan.

(2) *Reptomultisparsa* D'Orbigny, 1853 (Bryozoa, Cyclostomata): request for the designation of a type species. Z.N.(S.) 2400. P.D. Taylor.

(3) GOERIDAE Ulmer, 1903 versus TRICHOSTOMATIDAE Rambur, 1842 (Insecta, Trichoptera): request for a ruling under Article 23d(ii). Z.N.(S.) 1456. R.V. Melville (Secretary).

(4) *Atractocera latipes* Meigen, 1804 (Insecta, Diptera, Simuliidae): proposed conservation in the common usage with rejection of the presumed holotype under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2393. I.A. Rubtsov. (With comment by R.W. Crosskey).

*(5) *Choeropsis* Leidy, 1852 (Artiodactyla): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2407. R.M. Schoch & S.G. Lucas.

*(6) *Centrurus limpidus* Karsch, 1879 and *Centruroides ornatus* Pocock, 1902 (Arachnia, Scorpiones): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2446. O.F. Francke.

(7) *Leucaspis* Signoret, 1869 (Insecta, Homoptera, Diaspididae): proposed conservation by the suppression of *Leucaspis* Burmeister, 1835 (Insecta, Hymenoptera, Leucospidae). Z.N.(S.) 2448. E.M. Danzig & I.M. Kerzhner.

(8) *Tomiopsis* Benediktova, 1956 (Spiriferida, Brachiopoda): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2451. N.W. Archbold & G.A. Thomas.

(9) CAECILIIDAE in Amphibia and Insecta (Psocoptera): alternative proposals to remove the homonymy. Z.N.(S.) 2333. H.M. Smith & J.T. Polhemus.

(10) *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825], (Insecta, Lepidoptera): proposed conservation by the suppression of *Cydia* Hübner, [1825]. Z.N.(S.) 2421. V.I. Kuznetsov & I.M. Kerzhner.

*(11) *Byrrhus murinus* Fabricius, 1794 (Coleoptera, Byrrhidae): proposed conservation by the suppression of *Byrrhus undulatus* and *Byrrhus rubidus* Kugelann, 1792. Z.N.(S.) 2314. M. Mroczkowski.

*(12) *Rhopalocerus* W. Redtenbacher, 1842 (Coleoptera, Colydidae): proposed conservation by the suppression of *Spartycerus* Motschulsky, 1837. Z.N.(S.) 2456. M. Mroczkowski.

(13) *Capys* Hewitson (1865), (Lepidoptera, Lycaenidae), proposed conservation under the plenary powers: a restatement of the case. Z.N.(S.) 1748. A. Penrose.

(14) *Hyla lactea* Daudin, 1803 (Amphibia): request for conservation under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2341. J.D. Lynch & W.E. Duellman.

(15) *Cochliomyia* Townsend, 1915 (Diptera, Calliphoridae): proposed conservation by the suppression of *Callitroga* Brauer, 1883. Z.N.(S.) 707. R.V. Melville (Secretary).

(c) *Receipt of new applications.* The following new applications have been received since the publication of vol. 41(1) on 29 March 1984 (any marked with an asterisk involve the application of Articles 23a–b and 79b):

(1) *Neodorippe* Serène & Romimontarto, 1969 (Crustacea, Decapoda): proposed designation of type species under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2467. L.B. Holthuis & R.B. Manning.

(2) *Pyralis nigricana* Fabricius, 1794 (Insecta, Lepidoptera, Tortricidae): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2468. P.R. Seymour.

(3) *Octolasion* Örley, 1885 (Annelida, Oligochaeta, Lumbricidae): proposed validation. Z.N.(S.) 2469. R.W. Sims.

(4) *Cephalopholis argus* Schneider, 1801 (Pisces): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2470. J.E. Randall, M.L. Bauchot, A. Ben-Tuvia, P.C. Heemstra.

(5) Helminthological nomenclature. Z.N.(S.) 2471. R.S. Freeman.

(6) *Dasyurus hallucatus* Gould, 1842 (Marsupalia, Dasyuri-

dae): proposed conservation via suppression of *Mustela quoll* Zimmerman, 1783. Z.N.(S.) 2472. J.A. Mahoney & W.D.L. Ride.

(7) International Nomenclature of Diseases. Z.N.(S.) 2473. Z. Bankowski (Organisation Internationale des Sciences Médicales).

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

ELECTION TO COUNCIL

The following have been elected as ordinary members of the Council of the Commission: Professor Dr Holthuis and Mr D. Heppell for terms of six years; Dr F.M. Bayer for the three remaining years in the seat vacated by Dr Ride on his election as President of the Commission.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Since the last list of donors to the Appeal Fund was published in vol. 41 part 1 on 29 March 1984, we are glad to announce that the following have completed deeds of covenant to the Fund:

Mr M. Edwards, Professor V.C. Wynne-Edwards, FRS, Dr R.F. Avery, Dr R.J.V. Joyce, Dr N. D. Jago, Professor D.T. Donovan, Dr H.J. Gough, Mr J. Murlis, Professor H.B. Whittington FRS, Mr C. Collingwood, Mr P. Withers and Dr A. Brindle. We have also received donations from the Malacological Society of Japan, the Ichthyological Society of Japan, the Lepidopterological Society of Japan, Dr D.S. Hill, Dr J.P. O'Connor, Mr J. Riley and Dr R.E. Blackith. Grateful thanks are expressed to all these donors and to the Academia Sinica Taiwan, the Natural Environment Research Council, the Unione Zoological Italiana and the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, South Africa, for further welcome grants.

INTERNATIONAL CODE OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE THIRD EDITION

The Trust is pleased to announce that the contract for printing the third edition of the Code has been let to H. Charlesworth & Co. Ltd of Huddersfield, Yorkshire. Copies will be delivered on 30 November 1984 and publication will take place as soon as possible thereafter.

CLOSURE OF CERTAIN FILES

The backlog of several hundred unpublished files is being reviewed as time permits. A number of files are found no longer to have any meaning because the problems they present are now capable of automatic resolution. The following files have accordingly been closed: Z.N.(S.)

206 *Cyrtolaelaps* Berlese, 1887, and *Vegaia* Oudemans, 1905, status of
292 *Necrophorus* as emendation of *Nicrophorus* Fabricius, 1775
294 *Bombus muscorum* Linnaeus, 1758, identity of
449 *Thynnus affinis* Cantor, 1849 and *T. affinis* Guérin, 1838, relative List and Official Index, respectively
463 *Rhodites* Hartig, 1840 and *Diplolepis* Geoffroy, 1762, for Official List and Official Index, respectively
519 *Saxicava* Fleuriau, 1802, proposed conservation
541 A number of fish names for the Official List
584 *Osleroides* and *Vogeloides* Orlov, 1933, relative validity of names
597 *Ornithorhynchus* Blumenbach, 1800 for Official List
638 Suppression of five early trilobite generic names
669 *Prolecanites* Mojsisovics, 1882, alleged misidentified type species
671 *Agkistrodon* Beauvois, 1799 versus *Ancistrodon*
692 *Cyclostoma* Lamarck or *Cyclostoma* Draparnaud?
767 *Araneus patagiatus* Clerck, 1757, first reviser action
769 *Nassa* Lamarck, 1799, proposed conservation
774 *Chrysomela gemellata* Fourcroy, 1785, identity of
778 *Medusa beroe* Linnaeus, 1758, type species of *beroe*
780 *Mammut* Blumenbach, 1799 versus *Mastodon* Cuvier, 1817
781 Notification of neotypes for species of Orthoptera
982 *Gephuroceras* Hyatt, 1883, family name for

ICSEB—III
THIRD INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF SYSTEMATIC AND EVOLUTIONARY BIOLOGY, 1985

The Congress will be held on 4–10 July, 1985 at the University of Sussex, near Brighton, England. It is sponsored by the Royal Society, British Ecological Society, Linnean Society, Palaeontological Association and Systematics Association.

The major aims of this Congress, as with its highly successful predecessors in Boulder, Colorado (1973) and Vancouver (1980), are to encourage and facilitate the integration of the work of biologists in adjacent or overlapping fields in the general area of systematic and evolutionary biology.

The programme will include a number of symposia devoted to specially selected broad interdisciplinary themes, with invited speakers. The proposed subjects include:

Symbiosis in Evolution; Conservation of Tropical Ecosystems; Biogeographic Evolution of the Malay Archipelago; Adaptation Aspects of Physiological Processes; Co-evolution in Ecosystems and the Red Queen Hypothesis; Angiosperm Origins and the Biological Consequences; The Measurement of Rates of Evolution; Molecular Biology and Evolutionary Theory, Co-evolution and Systematics; Molecules versus Morphology in Phylogeny; Conflict or Compromise?; Random and Directed Events in Evolution; Biochemical Innovation in Microbial Communities.

There will also be a full provision for intending participants to suggest and arrange symposia of special interest to particular groupings of biologists. Other sessions will provide opportunities for the presentation of papers concerned with particular topics or groups of organisms. There will also be a number of poster sessions.

Accommodation and meals will be available on the campus of the University of Sussex. In addition, hotels are available in nearby Brighton, an attractive historic resort town on the South Coast.

Further information will only be sent to those who request it. Anyone wishing to be placed on the mailing list, or to suggest topics for Special Interest Symposia, or to contribute to any of the Congress Symposia listed above, should write to:

Professor Barry Cox,
c/o ICSEB Congress Office,
130 Queen's Road,
Brighton, Sussex BN1 3WE

R.V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
June 1984

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSALS CONCERNING *ASTACILLA* CORDINER, 1793. Z.N.(S.) 2319

(see vol. 40, pp. 163–164)

By L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Postbus 9517, RA 2300 Leiden, Netherlands*)

Dr Kensley states that no type-species designation for *Astacilla* Cordiner is known to him. However, such a designation was made by Fowler, 1912, *Rep. New Jersey State Museum,* for 1911, p. 525 where, under *Astacilla* Cordiner it is stated: 'Type *Oniscus longicornis* Sowerby, virtually designated by Stebbing, *Hist. Recent Crust.* (Intern. Sci. Ser. LXXIV), 1893, p. 371'. Stebbing, although he gave an extensive account of the history of the genus, did not designate a type species. He listed the known species and placed *A. longicornis* (Sowerby) first. I therefore believe that Fowler's designation is the first.

I regret not having provided Dr Kensley with this information before he sent in his application.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *CRINODES* HERRICH-SCHÄFFER, 1855 and *PERO* HERRICH-SCHÄFFER, 1855, Z.N.(S.)2436

By J. D. Holloway (*Commonwealth Institute of Entomology, 56 Queen's Gate, London SW7 5JR*)

I support the proposals of Fletcher & Nye concerning the usage of the genus-group names *Tarsolepis* Butler and *Crinodes* Herrich-Schäffer. *Tarsolepis sommeri* (Hübner) and allies are frequently referred to in economic literature on oriental Lepidoptera: the species both defoliate fruit trees in the larval stage and suck from the lacrymal secretions of mammals as adults. The species have been placed in combination with *Tarsolepis* in two recent reference works on oriental Lepidoptera (Barlow, 1982, *An Introduction to the Moths of South East Asia,* 305 pp., Kuala Lumpur; Holloway, 1983, *Malayan Nature J.*, vol. 37, pp. 1–107), and will be so in the imminent *Heterocera Sumatrana* treatment of the NOTODONTIDAE by R. Bender. Retention of *Tarsolepis* for these species is essential to avoid considerable confusion amongst entomologists in the oriental tropics.

ZYGAENA ANTHYLLIDIS BOISDUVAL, [1828] (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION, Z.N.(S.)2442

By C. M. Naumann (*Fakultät für Biologie, Universität Bielefeld, Postfach 8640, D-4800 Bielefeld 1, Germany)* and W. G. Tremewan (*British Museum (Natural History), London*)

[This is Dr Naumann's 28th paper in the series '*Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Gattung Zygaena F. und ihrer Vorstufen (Lepidoptera, Zygaenidae)*'. No. 27 is in press in *Entomofauna*]

Recently Koçak, 1982, p. 99, has shown that the species-group name in *Zygaena anthyllidis* Boisduval, [1828] is a junior secondary homonym of *Lycastes anthyllidis* Hübner, [1819] when both specific names are combined with *Zygaena* Fabricius, 1775 (ZYGAENIDAE); because of this Koçak has recalled from synonymy the name *Zygaena erebus* Meigen, 1829, for the species which for the last 155 years has been known as *Zygaena anthyllidis* Boisduval. Apart from being listed (and misspelt) by Sherborn, 1923, p. 371, *Lycastes anthyllidis* Hübner has not been used since it was first published.

2. *Zygaena anthyllidis* Boisduval is a well-known species endemic to the Pyrenees (type locality: Barèges, Hautes-Pyrénées; Boisduval, 1829, p. 3; 1834, p. 69); its identity is undisputed, the original description being clear and concise and accompanied by a good coloured illustration. Moreover, the lectotype is extant and preserved in the British Museum (Natural History), London (Tremewan, 1961, p. 271, pl. 52, fig. 34; pl. 61, figs 5, 6).

3. *Zygaena anthyllidis* Boisduval has been used as the valid name for the taxon since the latter was first described and illustrated in 1828; the more important papers and faunistic works where subsequently it has been described and illustrated, or mentioned, include those of Boisduval, 1834, p. 69, pl. 55, fig. 7; Duponchel, 1835, p. 76, pl. 7, fig. 1; Herrich-Schäffer, 1843, pl. 1, fig. 4; 1846, p. 40; Oberthür, 1884, p. 30, pl. 1, figs 14–17; 1910, p. 474; Spuler, 1906, p. 157, pl. 75, fig. 47, pl. 77, fig. 12; Seitz, 1907, p. 22, pl. 5e; and Reiss, 1930, p. 19, pl. 2e; 1933, p. 259. More recently it has been referred to in numerous publications, including the important systematic works of Haaf, 1952, p. 152, pl. 14 and Alberti, 1958, p. 317; 1964, p. 387, figs A3–C3, p. 388, fig. 3; 1981, p. 24, fig. 4(3); the faunistic works of Manley & Allcard, 1970, p. 122, pl. 37, fig. 8, and Gómez Bustillo & Fernández-Rubio, 1976, p. 148, figs; the papers on its biology by Holik, 1953a, p. 14 and Burgeff, 1975; the catalogues and check-lists of Reiss & Tremewan, 1967, p. 148, Agenjo, [1969], Leraut, 1980, p. 52 and Gómez Bustillo & Arroya Varela, 1981, p. 202; and the papers by Holik,

1937, p. 38; 1946, p. 254; 1953b, p. 47; Burgeff, 1950; and Fernández-Rubio, 1975; 1982.

4. *Lycastes anthyllidis* Hübner, [1819] was established as an objective replacement name for *Sphinx triptolemus* Hübner, [1806] (ZYGAENIDAE), a junior primary homonym of *Sphinx triptolemus* Cramer, 1779 (SPHINGIDAE). As already mentioned, except for the listing by Sherborn and the reintroduction by Koçak, the name *Lycastes anthyllidis* Hübner has been entirely overlooked and has not been used since it was first published in 1819.

5. *Sphinx triptolemus* Hübner, [1806] (type locality: 'Tyroler-alpen'; Hübner, [1806], p. 78), for which Hübner proposed the replacement name *Lycastes anthyllidis,* has been used as the supposedly valid name to denote the Tyrolean subspecies of *Zygaena loti* ([Denis & Schiffermüller], 1775) (Reiss & Tremewan, 1967, p. 140); the type is presumed lost but the original description and coloured illustrations are good and the taxon is recognizable. *Sphinx triptolemus* Hübner must not be used because, as explained, it is a junior primary homonym. The next available name for the taxon, *Lycastes anthyllidis* Hübner, [1819], was proposed as a new replacement name for it. However, the use of *anthyllidis* Hübner as the valid name for the Tyrolean subspecies of *Zygaena loti* would cause endless confusion with the current 155-year usage of *anthyllidis* Boisduval for a Pyrenean species. If *Lycastes anthyllidis* Hübner is suppressed there is a junior subjective synonym available to denote the Tyrolean subspecies of *Zygaena loti,* namely *Zygaena achilleae praeclara* Burgeff, 1926a, p. 32 (type locality: 'Südtirol — Täler um Bozen (Etsch-, Eisack- und Sarcatal), Grödner Tal, Seiser Alp, Menaggio' — syntypes in Entomologisches Institut, Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule, Zurich); this could therefore be used as the valid name. However, because the subspecies of all *Zygaena* species are undergoing a taxonomic revision that will inevitably reduce their number, we do not propose that this name be placed on the Official List.

6. On the basis of the above facts and in the interests of stability, we hereby request the Commission:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the specific name *anthyllidis* Hübner, [1819], as published in the binomen *Lycastes anthyllidis*, and all uses of that name prior to its use by Boisduval in 1828, for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy;

(2) to place the specific name *anthyllidis* Boisduval, [1828], as published in the binomen *Zygaena anthyllidis,* on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *anthyllidis* Hübner, [1819], as published in the binomen *Lycastes anthyllidis,* and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

AGENJO, R. [1969]. Catálogo ordenador de los lepidópteros en España. Zygaenidae [5 pp.]. *Graellsia*, vol. 23 (1967) [unpaginated].

ALBERTI, B. 1958–59. Über den stammesgeschichtlichen Aufbau der Gattung *Zygaena* F. und ihrer Vorstufen (Insecta, Lepidoptera). *Mitt. zool. Mus. Berl.*, vol. 34(1958), pp. 245–396, text-figs 1–4, pls 1–32; vol. 35(1959), pp. 203–242, pls 33–64.

——— 1964. Über *Zygaena armena* Ev. Ein Beitrag zu den Problemen von Artbildung und Artwertung (Lep., Zygaenidae). *Dtsch. entomol. Z.* (N.F.) vol. 11, pp. 381–392, text-figs 1–4, 1 pl.

——— 1981. Über Wesen und Aussagegrenzen der "Phylogenetischen Systematik" von Hennig, untersucht am Beispiel der Zygaenidae (Lepidoptera). *Mitt. münch. entomol. Ges.*, vol. 71, pp. 1–31, figs 1–4.

BOISDUVAL, J. A. [1828]. *Essai sur une Monographie des Zygénides.* Paris. xxvi, 132 pp., 8 pls.

——— 1829. *Monographie des Zygénides, Index Methodicus.* Paris. Errata et Addenda, 8 pp.

——— 1834–[1841]. *Icones historique des Lépidoptères nouveaux ou peu connus.* Paris. Vol. 2, 192 pp., pls 48–84.

BURGEFF, H. 1926a. Kommentar zum palaearktischen Teil der Gattung *Zygaena* Fab. des früher von Ch. Aurivillius und H. Wagner, jetzt von E. Strand herausgegebenen Lepidopterorum Catalogus. *Mitt. münch. entomol. Ges.*, vol. 16, pp. 1–86.

——— 1926b. Zygaenidae I (Generis *Zygaena* palaearctica pars). *In* Strand, E., *Lepid Cat.*, vol. 33, pp. 1–91.

——— 1950. Verbreitungsstudien an der Gattung *Zygaena* Fab. (Lepidoptera) (mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Problems der zwischen- und nacheiszeitlichen Besiedlung der Alpen). I. *Portug. Acta biol.* (A), vol. R. B. Goldschmidt. pp. 663–728, 6 figs, 21 maps.

——— 1975. Uber *Rhaphidozygaena anthyllidis* Boisduval. *Nachr. Akad. Wiss. Göttingen* (Math.-Phys. Klasse) no. 10, pp. 115–132, text-figs 1–7, I–X, pl., figs 1–12.

DUPONCHEL, P.-A.-J. 1835. *Histoire naturelle des Lépidoptères ou Papillons de France.* Paris. Supplement, vol. 2, 198 pp., 12 pls.

FERNÁNDEZ-RUBIO, F. 1975. *Genitalias (Andropigios) de las Zygaenas de la Peninsula Iberica.* Madrid [6] pp., 26 pls.

——— 1982. *Genitalias (Andropigios y Ginopigios) de las Zygaenas de Alava y su entorno ibérico.* Madrid [12] pp., 52 pls.

GÓMEZ BUSTILLO, M. R. & ARROYO VARELA, M. 1981. *Catalogo sistemático de los Lepidópteros Ibéricas.* Madrid. 499 pp.

——— & FERNÁNDEZ-RUBIO, F. 1976. *Mariposas de la Peninsula Ibérica.* Madrid. Heteróceros, vol. 1, 300 pp.

HAAF, E. 1952. Ueber die Genitalmorphologie der Zygaenen (Lep.), *Veröff. zool. StSamml. Münch.*, vol. 2, pp. 125–159, text-fig. 1, pls 4–16.

HERRICH-SCHÄFFER, G. A. W. 1843–51. *Systematische Bearbeitung der Schmetterlinge von Europa.* Regensburg. Vol. 2, XV. Zygaenides. Boisd., pp. 25–48, pls 1–16.

HOLIK, O. 1937. Quelques problèmes au sujet du genre *Zygaena* Fabr. II. De la nature de la ceinture abdominale. *Lambillionea*, vol. 37, pp. 32–45.

——— 1946. Sur les problèmes posés par le genre *Zygaena* Fabr. V. Variabilité sexuelle et individuelle. *Revue fr. Lépidopt.*, vol. 10, pp. 250–261, 273–280.

——— 1952–53a. Die Nahrungspflanzen der Zygaenenraupen und ihre Bedeutung für die Unterteilung der Gattung *Zygaena* Fabr. *Entomol. Z., Frankf.a.M.*, vol. 62, pp. 142–144, 153–159, 182–184, 188–191; vol. 63, pp. 3–6, 14–16, 20–32, 38–40, 55–56, 70–71.

——— 1953b. *Zyg. anthyllidis* Bsd. *NachrBl. bayer. Ent.*, vol. 2, p. 47.

HÜBNER, J. 1805–23. *Sammlung europäischer Schmetterlinge.* Augsburg. Der Ziefer, 194 pp.

——— 1816–[1826]. *Verzeichniss bekannter Schmettlinge.* Augsburg. 431. 72 pp.

KOÇAK, A. Ö. 1982. Additions and corrections to the names published in 'Systematic and synonymic list of the Lepidoptera of France, Belgium and Corsica' by Leraut, 1980. *Priamus,* vol. 2, pp. 97–133.

LERAUT, P. 1980. *Liste systématique et synonymique des Lépidoptères de France, Belgique et Corse.* Paris. 334 pp.

MANLEY, W. B. L. & ALLCARD, H. G. 1970. *A field Guide to the Butterflies and Burnets of Spain.* Hampton. 192 pp., 40 col. pls, frontispiece.

OBERTHÜR, C. 1884. *Études d'Entomologie.* Rennes. vol. 8, 53 pp., 1 pl.

——— 1910. *Études de Lépidoptérologie comparée.* Rennes. vol. 4, 691 pp., pls 35–58.

REISS, H. 1930–33. *In* Seitz, A., *Die Gross-Schmetterlinge der Erde.* Stuttgart. vol. 2, Supplement (1930–31). pp. 1–50, pls 1–4; (1933). pp. 249–278, pl. 16.

REISS, H. & TREMEWAN, W. G. 1967. A systematic catalogue of the genus *Zygaena* Fabricius (Lepidoptera: Zygaenidae). *Series entomol.*, vol. 2, xvi, 329 pp.

SEITZ, A. 1907–09. Gattung *Zygaena* F. *In* Seitz, A., *Die Gross-Schmetterlinge der Erde.* Stuttgart. vol. 2. pp. 18–34, pls 4–8.

SHERBORN, C. D. 1923. *Index Animalium* Part II, 1801–1850. London. pp. 129–384.

SPULER, A. 1906. *Die Schmetterlinge Europas.* Stuttgart. vol. 2. pp. 152–169, pls 75, 77.

TREMEWAN, W. G. 1961. A catalogue of the types and other specimens in the British Museum (Natural History) of the genus *Zygaena* Fabricius, Lepidoptera: Zygaenidae. *Bull. Br. Mus. nat. Hist.* (Entomol.), vol. 10, pp. 239–313, pls 50–64.

REPTOMULTISPARSA D'ORBIGNY, 1853 (BRYOZOA, CYCLOSTOMATA): REQUEST FOR THE DESIGNATION OF A TYPE SPECIES. Z.N.(S.)2400

By P. D. Taylor (*Department of Palaeontology, British Museum (Natural History), London SW7 5BD*)

When d'Orbigny, 1853, p. 875, erected the nominal genus *Reptomultisparsa* he listed the following 5 species without choosing a type species: *Diastopora diluviana* Milne Edwards, 1838 (non *Berenicea diluviana* Lamouroux, 1821), *Diastopora microstoma* Michelin, 1846, *Reptomultisparsa dutempleana* sp. nov., *R. glomerata* sp. nov., and *R. congesta* sp. nov. The valid name of the first named species is not *Diastopora diluviana* Milne Edwards, 1838 because Milne Edwards (1838, p. 228, pl. 15, figs 3, 3a, b, c; footnote (5) on pp. 228 and 229, and pl. 14, fig. 4 describe a dendroid variety which is probably a separate species) did not propose *D. diluviana* as a new species but merely intended it as a new generic attribution of *Berenicea diluviana* Lamouroux, 1821 (the type species of *Berenicea* Lamouroux, 1821, designated by Reuss, 1867). Inspection of Milne Edwards' figures supports d'Orbigny's (1853) opinion that the *Diastopora diluviana* (Lamouroux, 1821) of Milne Edwards, 1838, is not conspecific with *Berenicea diluviana* Lamouroux, 1821. D'Orbigny, 1853, placed his own nominal species *Diastopora incrustans* d'Orbigny, 1850 in synonymy with *'Diastopora diluviana* Milne Edwards, 1838 (non Lamouroux, 1821)'. This synonymy has been upheld by later revisers (Walter, 1970, p. 75; Buge & Fischer, 1970, p. 127). As there is no earlier available name for the species misidentified by Milne Edwards, 1838, as *Berenicea diluviana* Lamouroux, 1821, the valid name for this species is considered to be *Diastopora incrustans* d'Orbigny, 1850.

2. Gregory, 1896a, p. 151, selected the type species of *Reptomultisparsa* in the following way: *'R. microstoma* (Mich.) syn. *R. diluviana* Edw. & Mich. (non Lamx.)'. He went on to say 'The first of the five species referred to the genus by d'Orbigny, which is accordingly here taken as the type, is the *Diastopora diluviana* Edw. & Mich. (non Lamx.). This, however, I regard as the same as Michelin's *Diastopora microstoma'*. Consequently, Gregory, 1896a, placed in synonymy the first two species (i.e. *Diastopora incrustans* d'Orbigny, 1850 and *Diastopora microstoma* Michelin, 1846) listed under *Reptomultisparsa* by d'Orbigny, 1853, and considered the valid name of the species to be *Diastopora microstoma* Michelin, 1846.

3. Recent revision, including examination of types (Walter, 1970, corroborated by P.D.T.), has shown that *Diastopora incrustans* d'Orbigny, 1850 and *Diastopora microstoma* Michelin, 1846 are not synonymous. Furthermore, the species named as *Diastopora microstoma* Michelin, 1846 without description by Gregory, 1896a, was subsequently described and figured by Gregory, 1896b, as *Diastopora microstoma* Michelin, 1846 but is clearly *Diastopora incrustans* d'Orbigny, 1850. Therefore Gregory, 1896a, apparently misidentified *Diastopora microstoma* Michelin, 1846 when selecting it as the type species of *Reptomultisparsa.*

4. Article 70a of the Code specifies that misidentified type species should be referred to the Commission. Either *Diastopora microstoma* Michelin, 1846 or *Diastopora incrustans* d'Orbigny, 1850, both listed in the original description of *Reptomultisparsa* d'Orbigny, 1853, could serve as the type species of *Reptomultisparsa.* Whereas the latest revision of *Reptomultisparsa* by Walter, 1970, names *Diastopora incrustans* d'Orbigny, 1850, as the type species, two standard works of reference, the *Fossilium Catalogus* (Bassler, 1935) and the *Treatise* (Bassler, 1953), give *Diastopora microstoma* Michelin, 1846 as the type species.

5. It is recommended that *Diastopora incrustans* d'Orbigny, 1850 be selected as the type species of *Reptomultisparsa* d'Orbigny, 1853 because the lectotype (designated by Walter, 1970) of *Diastopora incrustans* d'Orbigny, 1850 is a fertile colony with abundant gonozooids. On the other hand, the neotype (chosen by Walter, 1970) of *Diastopora microstoma* Michelin, 1846 lacks gonozooids though present in putative conspecifics. Gonozooids are structures of great importance in the precise characterisation and classification of cyclostome species (see Taylor & Sequeiros, 1982). Modern usage (see Walter, 1970) of *Reptomultisparsa* for tubuloporinid cyclostomes having adnate multiserial colonies, commonly multilamellar, with large, longitudinally elongate (fusiform) gonozooids would be conserved if *Diastopora incrustans* d'Orbigny, 1850 were to be selected as the type species.

6. Canu, 1913, described a new nominal species *Berenicea edwardsi,* incorrectly calling it a nomen novum, for the species erroneously named *Diastopora diluviana* (Lamouroux, 1821) by Milne Edwards, 1838. *Berenicea edwardsi* Canu, 1913 is the type species by original designation of *Atractosoecia* Canu & Bassler, 1922. This species has been regarded as a junior synonym of *Diastopora incrustans* d'Orbigny, 1850 by Walter, 1970, and Buge & Fischer, 1970, an opinion also held by the present author. Therefore, selection of *Diastopora incrustans* d'Orbigny, 1850 as the type species of *Reptomultisparsa* would place *Atractosoecia* Canu & Bassler, 1922 in subjective synonymy with *Reptomultisparsa* d'Orbigny, 1853.

7. The Commission is therefore requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to designate the nominal species

Diastopora incrustans d'Orbigny, 1850 as type species of the nominal genus *Reptomultisparsa* d'Orbigny, 1853;

(2) to place the generic name *Reptomultisparsa* d'Orbigny, 1853, (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Diastopora incrustans* d'Orbigny, 1850, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *incrustans* d'Orbigny, 1850, as published in the binomen *Diastopora incrustans,* (specific name of type species of *Reptomultisparsa* d'Orbigny, 1853), on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

REFERNCES

BASSLER, R. S. 1935 Bryozoa. *Fossilium Cat.,* Pars Animalia, vol. 67, pp. 1–229.

——— 1953 Bryozoa; *in* Moore, R. C., *Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology,* part G, pp. 1–253.

BUGE, E. & FISCHER, J.-C. 1970. *Atractosoecia incrustans* (d'Orbigny) (Bryozoa Cyclostomata) espèce bathonienne symbiotique d'un Pagure. *Bull. Soc. géol. France* (7) vol. 12, pp. 126–133.

CANU, F. 1913. Contributions a l'étude des Bryozoaires fossiles. XIII. Bryozoaires jurassiques. *Bull. Soc. géol. France* (4) vol. 13, pp. 267–276.

——— & BASSLER, R. S. 1922. Studies on the cyclostomatous Bryozoa. *Proc. U.S. natn. Mus.* vol. 61 (22), pp. 1–160.

GREGORY, J. W. 1896a. A Revision of the British Jurassic Bryozoa. Part IV. The Genera *Reptomultisparsa* and *Diastopora. Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (6) vol. 17, pp. 151–155.

——— 1896b *Catalogue of the fossil Bryozoa in the Department of Geology British Museum (Natural History). The Jurassic Bryozoa.* London, pp. 1–231.

LAMOUROUX, J. 1821. *Exposition méthodique des genres de l'ordre des polypiers.* Paris, pp. 1–115.

MICHELIN. H. 1841–8. *Iconographie Zoophytologique.* Paris, pp. 1–348.

MILNE EDWARDS, H. 1838. Mémoire sur les Crisies, Les Hornères, et plusieurs autres Polypes vivans ou fossiles dont l'organisation est analogue à celle des Tubulipores. *Ann. Sci. nat.* Zoologie (2), vol. 9, pp. 193–238.

d'ORBIGNY, A. 1850. *Prodrome de Paléontologie* . . . vol. 1, Paris, pp. 1–394.

——— 1853. *Paléontologie française, terrains crétacés.* Tome 5: *Bryozoaires.* Paris, pp. 1–1191.

REUSS, A. E. 1867. Die Bryozoen, Anthozoen und Spongiarien des Braunen Jura von Balin bei Krakau. *Denkschr. Akad. Wiss. Wien* vol. 27, pp. 1–26.

TAYLOR, P. D. & SEQUEIROS, L. 1982. Toarcian bryozoans from Belchite in north-east Spain. *Bull. Br. Mus. nat. Hist.* (Geol.) vol. 36 (2), pp. 117–129.

WALTER, B. 1970. Les Bryozoaires Jurassiques en France. *Docums Lab. Géol. Fac. Sci. Lyon* vol. 35, pp. 1–328.

GOERIDAE ULMER, 1903 VERSUS TRICHOSTOMATIDAE RAMBUR, 1842 (INSECTA, TRICHOPTERA): REQUEST FOR A RULING UNDER ARTICLE 23d(ii). Z.N.(S.)1456

By the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

In 1961 (*Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 19, p. 301) Dr D. E. Kimmins proposed that the family-group name TRICHOSTOMATIDAE Rambur, 1842 (as 'Trichostomides') be rejected as a nomen oblitum under the provisions of Article 23b then in force. The application was not proceeded with owing to the uncertainty surrounding those provisions, and has subsequently been overlooked. Dr Kimmins no longer wishes to proceed with it, but Dr Peter Barnard (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) advises me that it ought to be pursued.

2. Dr Kimmins pointed out that the earliest family-group name for the taxon currently known as GOERIDAE (GOERINAE Ulmer, 1903, *Abh. Naturw. Ver. Hamburg*, vol. 18, p. 81) is TRICHOSTOMATIDAE Rambur, 1842, *Hist. nat. Ins. Névr.*, p. 489 (as 'Trichostomides'). The bases for these two family-group names are, respectively, *Goera* Stephens, 1829, *Nom. brit. Ins.* p. 28, type species, by subsequent designation by Westwood, 1840, *Introd. mod. Class. Ins.*, vol. 2, Syn. genera brit. Ins., p. 50, *Phryganea pilosa* Fabricius, 1775; *Trichostoma* Pictet, 1834, *Rech. Phrygan.*, p. 172, type species, by subsequent designation by Kimmins, 1961, *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 19, p. 301, *Trichostoma picicorne* Pictet, 1834, op. cit., p. 174, a junior subjective synonym of *Phryganea pallipes* Fabricius, 1781, *Spec. Ins.*, vol. 1, p. 388. (As that species is the type species of *Silo* Curtis, 1833—see Opinion 654, *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 20, pp. 119–120, 1963—*Trichostoma* Pictet, 1834 is a junior subjective synonym of *Silo* Curtis.)

3. TRICHOSTOMATIDAE has been used by Newman, 1853, *Zoologist* vol. 11, Appendix, p. cciv and by Acloque, 1897, *Faune de France*, vol. 2, p. 42, but since then the name has been abandoned in favour of GOERIDAE. The status of TRICHOSTOMATIDAE seems in any case to be anomalous. The name of its type genus is a junior subjective synonym; yet because the senior subjective synonym (*Silo* Curtis, 1833) is not the basis of a family-group name, Article 40 presumably does not apply, since it was not by reason of that synonymy that the family-group name was changed. On the other hand, Article 23d(ii) clearly applies, since the application of the Law of Priority to GOERIDAE and TRICHOSTOMATIDAE would clearly upset general usage. This is shown by the following references to recent uses of

GOERIDAE, kindly supplied by Dr Barnard:
Ross, 1944, p. 256 (Trichoptera of Illinois)
Ross, 1956, p. 10 (evolution of Trichoptera)
Schmid, 1958, p. 153 (Trichoptera of Ceylon)
Peterson, 1960, p. 369 (larvae of insects)
Kimmins, 1966, p. 118 (British check-list)
Lepneva, 1966, p. 322 (larvae of USSR)
Malicky, 1973, p. 12 (review of world Trichoptera)
Macan, 1973, p. 90 (key to British species)
Schmid, 1980, p. 143 (Trichoptera of Canada)
Malicky, 1983, p. 137 (key to European species).

4. Dr Kimmins's original application was supported by Dr F. C. J. Fischer (*Rotterdam*), Dr K. M. F. Scott (*University of Cape Town*), Dr Glenn B. Wiggins (*Royal Ontario Museum*) and Dr Bo Tjeder (*Falun, Sweden*). The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

(1) to rule under Article 23d(ii) that the family-group name GOERINAE Ulmer, 1903 is to be accepted as the valid name for any family-group taxon to which that name and TRICHOSTOMATIDAE Rambur, 1842 have been applied;

(2) to place the generic name *Goera* Stephens, 1829 (gender: feminine) type species, by subsequent designation by Westwood, 1840, *Phryganea pilosa* Fabricius, 1775, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *pilosa* Fabricius, 1775, as published in the binomen *Phryganea pilosa* (specific name of type species of *Goera* Stephens, 1829) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the family-group name GOERINAE Ulmer, 1903 (type genus *Goera* Stephens, 1829) on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology;

(5) to place the family-group name TRICHOSTOMATIDAE Rambur, 1842 (type genus *Trichostoma* Pictet, 1834) (invalid through the ruling requested under (1) above) on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

KIMMINS, D. E. 1966. A revised check-list of the British Trichoptera. *Entomologist's Gaz.*, vol. 17, pp. 111–120.

LEPNEVA, S. G. 1966. Trichoptera. II. 2. Larvae and pupae of Integripalpia. *Fauna SSSR* (N.S.), vol. 95, pp. 1–562. [In Russian.]

MACAN, T. T. 1973. A key to the adults of the British Trichoptera. *Scient. Publs Freshwat. biol. Ass.* no. 28. pp. 1–151.

MALICKY, H. 1973. *In* Kükenthal, W. (Editor). Trichopteren (Köcherfliegen). *Handb. Zool., Berl.*, vol. 4(2). part 29, pp. 1–114

——— 1983. *Atlas of European Trichoptera* x, 298 pp. The Hague.

PETERSON, A. 1960. *Larvae of insects an introduction to nearctic species Part II.* 416 pp. Columbus.

ROSS, H. H. 1944. The caddis flies, or Trichoptera, of Illinois. *Bull. Ill. nat. Hist. Surv.*, vol. 23(1), pp. vi, 1–326.

——— 1956. *Evolution and classification of the mountain caddisflies* viii, 213 pp. Urbana.

SCHMID, F. 1958. Trichoptères de Ceylan. *Arch Hydrobiol.*, vol. 54, pp. 1–173.

——— 1980. Genera des Trichoptères du Canada et des Etats adjacents. *Les insectes et Arachnides du Canada.* part 7, pp. 1–296.

ATRACTOCERA LATIPES MEIGEN, 1804 (INSECTA, DIPTERA, SIMULIIDAE): PROPOSED CONSERVATION IN THE COMMON USAGE WITH REJECTION OF THE PRESUMED HOLOTYPE UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.)2393

By I. A. Rubtsov (*Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., Leningrad 199164, U.S.S.R*)

Atractocera latipes was described by Meigen, 1804, p. 96, with the following statement 'Ich fing nur einmal ein Männchen im Mai in einer Hekke'. It is evident from Meigen's detailed autobiography, published by Morge in 1974, that up to 1804 Meigen collected only in the vicinity of Stolberg, near Aachen, and possibly near Solingen. The former is presumed to be the type locality. From the same source it is clear that up to 1804 Meigen had not received material from other zoologists. Meigen's original colour-drawing of the species was published by Morge, 1976.

2. Edwards, 1915 and 1920, following the interpretation of earlier authors, published good descriptions and figures of adults and early stages of *A. latipes*, which promoted more exact identification of the species by subsequent workers. Rubtsov, 1956; 1959–1964 and Davies, 1966; 1968 showed that a number of closely related species, differing mainly in characters of early stages, are united under *'latipes'* and restricted the use of the name.

3. The species (and even more the species-complex) under consideration is very common and widely distributed (from western Europe at least as far east as Lake Baikal, with numerous more or less doubtful records as far as Japan and outside the Palaearctic region). As a very active bloodsucker it has great medical and veterinary importance. It is included in many monographs (e.g. Rubtsov, 1940; 1956; 1959–1964; Pavlovsky, 1951; Grenier, 1953; Ussova, 1961; Carlsson, 1962; Knoz, 1965; Davies, 1966; 1968), in many Bulletins of WHO (the World Health Organisation) and in hundreds of papers dealing with its faunistic and ecological significance and the control of bloodsucking insects.

4. *Atractocera latipes* is the type species of *Cnetha* Enderlein, 1921 and of its junior synonymn *Pseudonevermannia* Baranov, 1926, the first being regarded as a distinct genus by the majority of modern specialists in the group. It is a large genus (about ninety species) distributed all over the Holarctic region.

5. Davies (in Crosskey & Davies, 1972) examined two specimens standing under the name *'latipes'* in Meigen's collection, one a male with the label *'latipes'* 'in what appears to be Meigen's handwriting' and one a female. The male belongs to *Simulium subexcisum* Edwards, 1915, now in the genus *Hellichiella* Rivosecchi & Cardinali, 1978, and the specific name is in current general usage as defined under Article

79b of the Code. The female belongs to *Simulium austeni* Edwards, 1915 (*posticatum* Meigen, 1838, a forgotten name).

6. Crosskey & Davies (1972) concluded that the male is Meigen's holotype, and changed the name *S. subexcisum* to *S. latipes.*

7. As *latipes* sensu Edwards remained without an available name Crosskey & Davies, 1972, used the name *Simulium vernum* Macquart, 1826 for it. The latter was described probably from northern France (the exact locality was not indicated in the description) and had since remained a doubtful name, mentioned in catalogues only. The types are lost and a neotype was not designated by Crosskey & Davies, 1972, due to the absence of French material. The original description is very short and, although it does not conflict with *latipes* sensu Edwards, it can be attributed to many other species.

8. The nomenclature of Crosskey & Davies, 1972, was followed by them and by Zwicky & Crosskey, 1980, but many specialists (e.g. J. Knoz, V. Patrusheva, L. Rivosecchi, I. A. Rubtsov, J. Smart, A. Terterian, Z. Ussova) and many practical workers continue to use the name *latipes* in Edwards' sense.

9. Crosskey & Davies' 1972 statement, that the male examined by them is the holotype of *A. latipes,* is doubtful. After 1804 Meigen was in contact with many entomologists and his collection was greatly enlarged by his own findings and by material sent to him from various European countries. In 1840 his collection was purchased by the Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle in Paris. As shown by Zwick & Crosskey, 1980, some of Meigen's type specimens of simuliids were lost between 1804 and 1840 and some specimens (including the female under *'latipes'*) were added after original publication. As Meigen's specimens have no collecting labels, it is impossible to state whether the male labelled *'latipes'* is the holotype or a subsequently added specimen.

10. *S. subexcisum* Edwards is only known from England (the type locality is Crowborough, Sussex, holotype: male, in the Museum of Zoology, Cambridge) and France. The nearest record of *S. subexcisum* to the type locality of *A. latipes* (which is near Aachen) is in the environs of Strasbourg, at a distance of about 260 kilometres. *S. subexcisum* has never been found in West Germany, the fauna of which is well known. It can be supposed that the male, examined by Davies, originates from material received from France or England by Meigen after 1804.

11. In Meigen's figure of *A. latipes* (see Morge, 1976) the basitarsus of the hind leg is broader than the tibia. This agrees better with *latipes* in the common sense (in which the basitarsus is equal or slightly broader than the tibia) than with *subexcisum* (in which the basitarsus is broad, but narrower than the tibia). Meigen had special training in drawing (see Morge, 1974) and his figures are very precise.

12. Regardless of the doubtful status of the presumed holotype, this is certainly a case in which the plenary powers should be used, firstly

because two names in general current usage are changed (one of them belongs to a species of great importance and the type species of a large genus) and secondly because the change of names introduces confusion. The designation of a neotype of *A. latipes* in accordance with common usage is desirable, but I have no material from West Germany. I think Mrs H. Zwick, who has a large amount of material of this common species from West Germany, could propose an appropriate specimen.

13. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is therefore asked:

(1) to set aside under the plenary powers the specimen MNHN, Paris, No. 525, considered by Crosskey & Davies, 1972, as the holotype of *Atractocera latipes* Meigen, 1804 and to state that this species should be treated in the sense used by Edwards, 1915; 1920; Rubtsov, 1956; 1959–1964 and Davies, 1966; 1968 or as defined by the neotype, if a corresponding designation can be made;

(2) to place the name *latipes* Meigen, 1804, as published in the binomen *Atractocera latipes* and as defined under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

BARANOV, N. 1926. Eine neue Simuliiden-Art und einige Bemerkungen über das System der Simuliiden. *Wiss. Insektenbiol.* vol. 3, pp. 15–16.

CARLSSON, G. 1962. Studies on Scandinavian black-flies. *Opuscula entomol.*, Suppl. XXI, 280 pp.

CROSSKEY, R. W. & DAVIES, L. 1972. The identities of *Simulium lineatum* (Meigen), *S. latipes* (Meigen) and *S. vernum* Macquart (Diptera: Simuliidae). *Entomologist's Gaz.* vol. 23(4), pp. 249–258.

DAVIES, L. 1966. The taxonomy of British black-flies (Diptera: Simuliidae). *Trans. r. entomol. Soc. London*, vol. 118(14), pp. 413–506.

——1968. A key to the British species of Simuliidae (Diptera) in the larval, pupal and adult stages. *Scient. publs freshwat. biol. Assoc.* No. 24, 125 pp.

EDWARDS, F. W. 1915. On the British species of *Simulium*.—I. The adults. *Bull. entomol. Res.* vol. 6, pp. 23–42.

——1920. On the British species of *Simulium*.—II. The early stages; with corrections and additions to Part I. *Bull. entomol. Res.* vol. 11, pp. 211–246.

ENDERLEIN, G. 1921. Das System der Kriebelmücken (Simuliidae). *Dt. tierärztl. Wschr.* vol. 16, pp. 198–200.

GRENIER, P. 1953. Simuliidae de France et d'Afrique du Nord. *Encycl. entomol. (Ser, A)* vol. 29, 170 pp.

KNOZ, J. 1965. The identification of Czechoslovakian black-flies (Diptera, Simuliidae). *Folia Fac. Sci. nat. Purkynianae Brunnensis (Biol.) 2*, vol. 6(5), 54 pp.+425 Abb.

MEIGEN, J. W. 1804. *Klassifikazion und Beschreibung der europäischen zweiflügligen Insekten. I.* Reichard, Braunschweig, pp. 1–152.
——1838. *Systematische Beschreibung der bekannten europäischen zweiflügligen Insekten. VII.* Schulz, Hamm, 434 pp.
MORGE, G. 1974. Johann Wilhelm Meigen. *Beitr. Entomol.*, vol. 24 Sonderheft), pp. 93–160.
——— 1976. Dipteren-Farbtafeln nach den bischer nicht veröffentlichten Original-Handzeichnungen Meigens: 'Johann Wilhelm Meigen: Abbildung der europaeischen zweiflügeligen Insekten, nach der Natur'. Pars I. *Beitr. Entomol.*, vol. 25, pp. 383–500.
PAVLOVSKY, E. N. 1951. *Bloodsucking Diptera, their significance and control.* Leningrad. 120 pp. (in Russian).
RIVOSECCHI, L. 1978. Simuliidae Diptera Nematocera. *Fauna Ital.* vol. 13, 555 pp.
——— & CARDINALI, R. 1978. Contributo alla conoscenca dei Simuliidi Italiani. XXIII. Nuevi dati taxonomici. *Riv. Parassittol.* vol. ??, pp. 26–78.
RUBTSOV, I. A. 1940. Black-flies (Fam. Simuliidae). *Fauna SSSR* vol. 6(6), 533 pp. (in Russian).
——1956. Black-flies (Fam. Simuliidae) (2nd edition). *Fauna SSSR* (N.S.) No. 64, Diptera vol. 6(6), 859 pp. (in Russian).
——1959–1964 Simuliidae (Melusinidae) (parts). *In* LINDNER, E. (Ed.): *Fliegen palaearkt. Reg.* vol. III 4, 689 pp.
USSOVA, Z. V. *Fauna of black-flies of Karelia and Murmansk Region (Diptera, Simuliidae).* Moscow-Leningrad, 7 pp. (in Russian).
ZWICK, H. & CROSSKEY, R. W. 1980. The taxonomy and nomenclature of the blackflies (Diptera: Simuliidae) described by J. W. Meigen. *Aquatic Insects* vol. 2(4), pp. 225–247.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF THE SPECIFIC NAME *LATIPES* MEIGEN, 1804 (DIPTERA, SIMULIIDAE) IN ITS FORMER MISIDENTIFIED SENSE, AND REQUEST FOR ALTERNATIVE ACTION. Z.N.(S.)2393.

By R. W. Crosskey (*British Museum (Natural History), London*)

The species of SIMULIIDAE concerned in Dr Rubtsov's proposal is widespread across the Holarctic region. As with many simuliids, it may prove to be a sibling species complex, but in the morphological sense of current taxonomy is a species that often needs to be identified in its early stages because it is a common component of stream and river faunas that are prospected for faunistic or ecological studies.

2. As Rubtsov states, the pioneer work of Edwards, 1915; 1920, established an identity for '*latipes*' by applying this name to a species

that he described from both sexes of the adult and from the associated pupal stage. Edwards had not seen Meigen's collection of SIMULIIDAE (then and still in the Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris) and he used Meigen's name for the species concerned simply because this guesswork application of the name had been made already by his predecessors. He used the binomen *Simulium latipes* (Meigen, 1804) and made his position clear: 'This [species] has always been assumed to be Meigen's *S. latipes*, and I see no particular reason to doubt that it is so'.

3. Edwards was attempting to elucidate the confused taxonomy of European simuliids; he accepted pre-existing interpretations of names as correct if he saw no reason to doubt them, but sometimes had to make his own interpretations of the various nominal species that Meigen described. When in doubt he described species as new, whilst remaining well aware that some of his names applying to supposedly new species might later prove to be synonymous. This is clear from his statement, for example, in the description (Edwards, 1915, p. 33) of his *S. morsitans* Edwards where he comments that 'it is possible that one of the older names may apply to this species'. Edwards clearly anticipated corrections to the nomenclature as knowledge improved.

4. Edwards's interpretation of which species should bear Meigen's name *latipes* remained in force until the 1960s, when Davies, 1966, showed that in Britain alone at least six morphologically distinguishable species had been confused under this name. A reappraisal was needed to decide which of the six should continue to carry the name *latipes* in the restricted sense, but it was not at that time appreciated that Meigen's type specimen did not belong to the complex of species at all (it had not been studied by any modern worker and was not available on loan). Davies, whilst continuing to follow Edwards's interpretation in the broad sense, restricted the name *latipes* to a very common member of the group of six species that is widespread in lowland Britain and in continental Europe, and commented that 'in the absence of Meigen's type, there is some doubt as to the species to which this name should be applied'.

5. The word 'absence' in Davies's comment appeared to imply that the type was known to be lost, but in fact meant only that he had not seen it. A study of Meigen's simuliid collection made by Crosskey in 1969 showed a male specimen labelled as *latipes* to be present in the collection and clearly acceptable on all the evidence as an original type specimen. Subsequent detailed morphological examination of this specimen by Crosskey & Davies, including slide preparation and illustration of the taxonomically very important genitalia by Davies, showed conclusively that it did not belong to the species accepted by Edwards as *latipes*. Instead, it belongs to a species of a quite different group of simuliids, to one that Edwards, 1915, had described as new under the name *Simulium subexcisum*. As the *latipes* male in Meigen's collection was considered indubitably to have holotype status (discussion in detail

by Crosskey & Davies, 1972) it became clear that '*latipes*' sensu Edwards was a longstanding misidentification in need of correction. To call attention to the findings and rectify the nomenclature, Crosskey & Davies, 1972:—

(1) Reassigned the name *latipes* Meigen to the species represented by its holotype, thereby using it as the senior synonym of *subexcisum* Edwards.

(2) Brought the old name *Simulium vernum* Macquart, 1826, into use for the species misidentified by Edwards as *latipes* of Meigen and subsequently so known, applying it to the member species of the '*latipes*-group' to which the name had been restricted by Davies.

(3) Used the name '*vernum*-group' in place of the now improper use of the term '*latipes*-group'.

It was explained that no type exists for *vernum* Macquart but that a neotype would be designated when suitable material became available from northern France. In the meantime, use of the name *vernum* was desirable because it pushed the name back to an early date (1826) beyond which further nomenclatural disturbance was extremely unlikely through discovery of an even earlier applicable name; nothing in Macquart's description contra-indicated its legitimate application to the misidentified '*latipes*' sensu Edwards/Davies, and it was free from a pre-established usage. Furthermore, the species concerned is normally univoltine with spring emergence and Macquart's name is therefore appropriate. A neotype has not been designated as yet.

Comments on aspects of Dr Rubtsov's proposal

6. It is to the procedurally proper nomenclatural action taken by Crosskey & Davies, 1972, that Dr Rubtsov now objects—eleven years after its publication—and for which he seeks Commission support to restore the nomenclatural *status quo* existing before 1972. In essence, his proposal asks ICZN:— (a) to rule that the specimen accepted by Crosskey-Davies as holotype has no type status; (b) to designate an unspecified and unprovided specimen on his behalf as the neotype of *latipes* Meigen that will ensure that this name remains attached to the species '*latipes* sensu Edwards, not Meigen'; (c) as the consequence of (a) and (b), to declare itself in favour of restoring pre-1972 usage.

(1) The proposal thus put to the Commission is one to which strong objection is here raised, for if implemented it would create damaging confusion in the nomenclature of widely known species and species groups of SIMULIIDAE for which a new acceptance and stability has been reached in the past 11 years (see paragraph 9).

(2) According to Dr Rubtsov (his paragraph 3), the species for which he wishes the name *latipes* Meigen to be upheld has 'great medical and veterinary importance'. No reference is

provided in support of this misleading statement. In North America and Europe the species has no such importance, and indeed there are extraordinarily few biting records for it. There is some man-biting nuisance attributable to the species but localized to eastern U.S.S.R. The species has never been the target of any control operation, nor is it even mentioned in the 400-page recent book concerned with SIMULIIDAE as pests (Laird, ed., 1981). The species concerned ('*latipes*' of authors) has virtually no impact on man or livestock and no defence of 'usage' can be rested on socio-economic importance.

(3) Rubtsov considers it doubtful if the specimen in the Paris Museum accepted as *latipes* Meigen holotype by Crosskey and Davies has type status. It cannot, certainly, be absolutely proved that it has—but the same can be said for any specimen deemed on the available evidence to be the type for a species bearing a very old name. It is known that the specimen was present in the Meigen collection when that was received at the Paris Museum (facsimile of original inventory of Meigen's SIMULIIDAE published in Zwick & Crosskey, 1981), that it bears Meigen's own label identifying it as *latipes*, and that its sex and characters are not in conflict with Meigen's descriptions of 1804 and 1818. How much more evidence can we reasonably expect to have for type status in the case of such an old name? If the specimen is rejected as type, then other simuliid specimens considered to be types in the Meigen collection should be equally rejected (including that of *nigra* Meigen which Rubtsov himself holds to be the type). Indeed, almost all really old types would have to be rejected because proof absolute of their type status can seldom if ever be obtained.

(4) To cast doubt on the type status of the *latipes* specimen in question, Dr Rubtsov (his paragraph 10) argues that 'It can be supposed that the male, examined by Davies, originates from material received from France or England by Meigen after 1804' (i.e. date of original description). This is a remarkable, groundless, and unwarranted assumption, because there is no documentary evidence that Meigen ever received simuliid material from these countries. Rubtsov's rationale for the statement is that the species represented by the *latipes* holotype (that is to say, the species also known by the name *subexcisum*) cannot be present in Germany. (The type locality of *latipes* is not stated in the original or the later Meigen description, but the very early-described Diptera in his works are believed to have been collected in the area of Stolberg near Aachen where Meigen lived.)

Rubtsov's supposition of its absence from Germany rests on the false premise that the simuliid fauna of West Germany 'is well known', and therefore that Meigen cannot in 1804 have had a specimen available to him of *subexcisum* (i.e. *latipes* if the Meigen specimen is holotype)—because this species is unrecorded from Germany. Far from being well known, there is no existing monograph of German SIMULIIDAE, nor has north-west Germany been thoroughly prospected for simuliids at the critical level that would be likely to show the occurrence of this species. *Simulium subexcisum/latipes* can be easily overlooked as its adults are non-mammalophilic, it often breeds cryptically in slow pasture seepages or other minor flows, and it is a rather uncommon and patchily distributed species; furthermore great environmental changes have occurred in the area of the presumed *latipes* type locality. Lack of proof that the species occurs today in West Germany is no basis for assuming that Meigen could not have collected a specimen in the Aachen area before 1804.

(5) Dr Rubtsov is seemingly very out of touch with the post-1972 simuliid literature, and therefore with the extent to which the conclusions reached and published by Crosskey & Davies (1972) have been understood and accepted. In reality, virtually all workers have adopted the name *vernum* Macquart in place of *latipes* sensu authors, not Meigen.

7. According to Rubtsov's proposal, six named taxonomists (excluding himself) 'continue to use the name *latipes* in Edwards' sense'. However, not one bibliographic reference is given in his proposal to support this statement, and nearly all the workers mentioned were, or are still, unaware of the point at issue. Of the six specialists mentioned, only Rivosecchi (1978) has been aware of the Crosskey & Davies (1972) work and—knowing the nomenclatural problem—has chosen to continue with the use of the name *latipes* in its former sense (i.e. with 'usage' of *latipes* sensu Edwards). The other five erstwhile taxonomists that Rubtsov lists are dead, or have ceased active work in taxonomy and their names are irrelevant to Rubtsov's case.

8. In deciding the strength of Rubtsov's proposal the Commission should note that Professor Rivosecchi's preference for maintaining usage, along with Rubtsov's own, has to be set against the preference of those other taxonomists who in substantial taxonomic and ecological-faunistic works have preferred to accept the conclusions of Crosskey & Davies, 1972, and who have accordingly adopted the name *vernum* in place of *latipes* for the species concerned. These include: Zwick (1974, Germany, and 1978, Europe). Zwick (1976, Austria); Peterson (1977, Iceland); Raastad (1979, Fennoscandia); Cupp & Gordon (1983, United States).

9. The view of most taxonomists that the name *vernum* should legitimately be used for the former *latipes* of authors has found its way through to the non-taxonomists working on SIMULIIDAE, and there is now (since 1972) a substantial literature published in many countries in which *Simulium vernum* Macquart—or alternatively *Eusimulium vernum* (Macquart)—is used as the valid name for the species under discussion (and also for the species group of which it is the nomenclatural pivot). The papers cover a great variety of biological fields and include the following:—

Adult biology:

(1) Davies, D. M., Györkös, H. & Raastad, J. E. 1977, *Norwegian J. Entomol.*, vol. 24, pp. 19–23. [Norway]

(2) Golini, V. I., Davies, D. M. & Raastad, J. E. 1976, *Norwegian J. Entomol.*, vol. 23, pp. 79–86. [Norway]

Eggs:

(3) Imhof, J. E. & Smith, S. M. 1979, *Bull. entomol. Res.*, vol. 69, pp. 405–425. [Canada]

Faunistics:

(4) Beaucournu-Saguez, G. 1975, *Annls Parasitol. hum. comp.*, vol. 50, pp. 105–122. [Spain)

(5) Crosskey, R. W. 1982, *Entomologist's Gaz.*, vol. 33, pp. 199–212. [England]

(6) Cupp, E. W. & Gordon, A. E. 1983, *Search: Agriculture*, vol. 25, pp. 1–74. [U.S.A.]

(7) Glatthaar, R. 1978, *Vjschr. naturf. Ges. Zürich*, vol. 123, pp. 71–124. [Switzerland]

(8) Gonzàlez, G. 1980. *Butll. Inst. Cat. Hist. nat.* (Zool.), vol. 45, pp. 97–106. [Andorra]

(9) Hansford, R. G. 1978, *Freshwat. Biol.* vol. 8, pp. 521–531. [England]

(10) Merritt, R. W., Ross, D. H. & Peterson, B. V., 1978, *Gt Lakes Entomol.*, vol. 11, pp. 177–208. [U.S.A.]

(11) Peterson, B. V. 1977, *Can. Entomol.*, vol. 109, pp. 449–472. [Iceland]

(12) Post, R. J. 1981, *Trans. Norfolk & Nor. Nat. Soc.*, vol. 25, pp. 153–163. [England]

(13) Raastad, J. E. 1979, *Rhizocrinus*, vol. 11, pp. 1–28. [Scandinavia]

(14) Wichard, G. 1976, *Gewässer und Abwässer*, vol. 60/61, pp. 35–64. [Germany]

(15) Zwick, H. 1974, *Abh. senckenb. naturforsch. Ges.*, vol. 533, pp. 1–116. [Germany]

(16) Zwick, H. 1976, *Z. ArbGem. öst. Entomol.*, vol. 28, pp. 73–77. [Austria]

(17) Zwick, H. 1978, *Limnofauna Europaea*, Simuliidae, pp. 396–403. [Europe]

Larval biology:

(7) Glatthaar—reference as above.

(10) Merritt *et al.*—reference as above.

(14) Wichard—reference as above.

(18) Wotton, R. S., 1977, *Oikos*, vol. 29, pp. 332–335. [England]
(15) Zwick—reference as above.
Morphometrics:
(19) Kazimirová, M. 1982. *Biologia (Bratislava)*, vol. 37, pp. 973–977. [Czechoslovakia]
Seasonality:
(20) Back, C. & Harper, P. P. 1979, *Can J. Zool.*, vol. 57, pp. 627–639. [Canada]

10. The literature cited above indicates conclusively that the change of name from *latipes* auct. to *vernum*, introduced by Crosskey & Davies, 1972, has been accepted by a range of specialists in different countries and with varied interests. A reversion now to the use of *latipes* Meigen for the species fast becoming almost universally known as *vernum* would be disruptive to the newly evolving nomenclatural stability, and the proposal contained in Dr Rubtsov's application should be rejected accordingly. Rubtsov has allowed eleven years to pass since Crosskey & Davies, 1972, formulated the necessary nomenclatural changes to which he now objects, and a new stability based on the actions of these authors has come about in that time. It would therefore be inimical to the interests of simuliid specialists in most of the world if ICZN were now to rule as Dr Rubtsov wishes.

11. In the matter of a neotype for *latipes* Meigen sensu Edwards, sought by Rubtsov in his proposal, it is difficult to see how the Commission can act even if it wishes since Rubtsov is offering no particular specimen for ICZN to recognize and designate.

Conclusion and request for alternative action

12. In the light of the facts brought out in these comments the Commission is asked not to support Dr Rubtsov's proposal, but instead to act as follows:

(1) to rule that the specific name *latipes* Meigen, 1804, as originally published in the binomen *Atractocera latipes*, is to be interpreted by reference to the specimen recognized by Crosskey & Davies, 1972, as the holotype of the species;
(2) to place the specific name *latipes* Meigen, 1804, as originally published in the binomen *Atractocera latipes*, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;
(3) to place the specific name *vernum* Macquart, 1826, as published in the binomen *Simulia* [sic] *vernum* by Macquart (*Recl. Trav. Soc. Sci. Agric. Lille* 1823/1824, p. 79), on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

CROSSKEY, R. W. & DAVIES, L. 1972. The identities of *Simulium lineatum* (Meigen), *S. latipes* (Meigen) and *S. vernum* Macquart (Diptera: Simuliidae). *Entomologist's Gaz.* vol. 23, pp. 249–258.

CUPP, E. W. & GORDON, A. E. (eds.). 1983. Notes on the systematics, distribution, and bionomics of black flies (Diptera: Simuliidae) in the northeastern United States. *Search: Agriculture*, No. 25, 75 pp.

DAVIES, L. 1966. The taxonomy of British black-flies (Diptera: Simuliidae). *Trans. R. entomol. Soc. Lond.* vol. 118, pp. 413–511.

EDWARDS, F. W. 1915. On the British species of *Simulium*.—I. The adults. *Bull. entomol. Res.* vol. 6, pp. 23–42.

——— 1920. On the British species of *Simulium*.—II. The early stages; with corrections and additions to part I. *Bull. entomol. Res.* vol. 11, pp. 211–246.

LAIRD, M. (ed.) 1981. *Blackflies: the future for biological methods in integrated control.* xii + 399 pp. Academic Press, London etc.

MACQUART, J. 1826. Insectes Diptères du nord de la France. Tipulaires. *Recl. Trav. Soc. Sci. Agric. Lille* 1823–1824, pp. 59–224.

MEIGEN, J. W. 1804. *Klassifikazion und Beschreibung der europäischen zweiflügligen Insekten. (Diptera Linn.)* Vol. 1, part 1, xxviii + 152 pp. Reichard, Braunschweig [= Brunswick].

———1818. *Systematische Beschreibung der bekannten europäischen zweiflügeligen Insekten.* Vol. 1, xxxvi + 332 pp. Forstmann, Aachen.

PETERSON, B. V. 1977. The black flies of Iceland (Diptera: Simuliidae). *Can. Entomol.* vol. 109, pp. 449–472.

RAASTAD, J. E. 1979. Fennoscandian black-flies (Diptera, Simuliidae): annotated list of the species and their gross distribution. *Rhizocrinus*, vol. 11, pp. 1–28.

RIVOSECCHI, L. 1978. Simuliidae Diptera Nematocera. *Fauna d'Italia*, vol. 13, viii + 533 pp. Calderini, Bologna.

ZWICK, H. 1974. Faunistisch-ökologische und taxonomische Untersuchungen an Simuliidae (Diptera), unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Arten des Fulda-Gebietes. *Abh. senckenb. naturforsch. Ges.*, vol. 533, pp. 1–116.

———1976. Zur Kenntnis der Kriebelmücken-Fauna (Simuliidae, Diptera) Östereichs. *Z. ArbGem. öst. Ent.*, vol. 28, pp. 73–77.

———1978. Simuliidae. Pp. 396–403 *in* Illies, J. (ed.), *Limnofauna Europaea*. 2nd edit., xvii + 532 pp., Fischer, Stuttgart and New York; Swets & Zeitlinger, Amsterdam.

——— & CROSSKEY, R. W. [1981]. The taxonomy and nomenclature of the blackflies (Diptera: Simuliidae) described by J. W. Meigen. *Aquatic Insects*, vol. 2 (1980), pp. 225–247. [Work issued in 1981 and not in the nominal year of 1980.]

CHOEROPSIS LEIDY, 1852 (ARTIODACTYLA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.)2407

By Robert M. Schoch and Spencer G. Lucas (*Yale University, P.O. Box 6666, New Haven, Connecticut 06511, U.S.A.*)

The object of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers to suppress a name, which so long as it remains an available name, represents a potential threat to the often used and widely accepted generic name of the pygmy hippopotamus, *Choeropsis* Leidy, 1852.

2. S. G. Morton (1844, p. 15) proposed the binomen *Hippopotamus minor* for the skull of a small, extant hippopotamus from western Africa. With regard to this proposal, Morton (1849, p. 235) later quoted a long personal letter from H. Falconer who stated that 'Cuvier had preoccupied the specific name of *H. minor* for this small European fossil species, which he called both *H. minor* and *H. minutus*.' Although Falconer's statement technically was inaccurate (Desmarest, 1822, p. 388 named *H. minor*), Morton (1849, p. 232) proposed the name *H. liberiensis* Morton, 1849 to replace *H. minor* Morton, 1844. Since *H. minor* Morton, 1844 was a junior primary homonym of *H. minor* Desmarest, 1822, *H. minor* Morton, 1844 is permanently invalid (Art. 59a), and Morton (1849) correctly replaced it with *H. liberiensis* Morton, 1849.

3. J. Leidy (1852a, p. 52) removed *H. liberiensis* Morton, 1849 from *Hippopotamus* Linnaeus, 1758 and made it the type species of the new genus *Choerodes* Leidy, 1852. Leidy (1852b, p. 213) later proposed the new generic name *Choeropsis* Leidy, 1852 to replace the name *Choerodes* Leidy, 1852 because he believed *Choerodes* was preoccupied by *Chaerodes* White, 1846 (type species *C. trachyscelides* White, 1846), an insect genus.

4. White's (in White & Butler, 1846, p. 12) original spelling of the name *Chaerodes* used an unambiguous ligature, but Leidy's (1852a, p. 52) original spelling of the name *Choerodes* used an ambiguous ligature. Thus, for example, MacAlister (1873, p. 494) spelled the name of Leidy's taxon *'Chaerodes'*. Nevertheless, on the same page in Leidy, 1852a, as the original spelling of *Choerodes,* the same ligature is used to spell 'Phoenixville', a town in Pennsylvania (U.S.A.). This indicates that '*Choerodes*', not '*Chaerodes*', was the correct original spelling of *Choerodes* Leidy, 1852. This conclusion also is supported by the fact that Leidy, 1852a, probably derived the name *Choerodes,* and later (Leidy, 1852b) the name *Choeropsis,* from the Greek 'choiros' ('pig'), normally written as choeros or choerus (for example, the names of the extant hogs *Hylochoerus* and *Phacochoerus*). Since *Choerodes* Leidy,

1852 differs from *Chaerodes* White, 1846 in one letter, the two names are not, as Leidy believed, homonyms (Art. 56a). Therefore, Leidy (1852b, p. 213) need not have replaced *Choerodes* with *Choeropsis*.

5. The generic name *Choeropsis* Leidy, 1852, however, has been cited repeatedly in the zoological literature since Leidy, 1852b. Pertinent examples include Milne-Edwards (1868–1874, p. 44), Ritchie (1930, p. 204), Cristino (1958, p. 389), Sidney (1965, p. 119), Corbet (1969, p. 387), Saban (1971, p. 306), Olivier (1975, p. 211) and Walker (1975, p. 1370). In addition, the name *Choeropsis* is widely known and appears on labels in the many zoological gardens where pygmy hippopotami are displayed.

6. Therefore, recognition and validation of the name *Choerodes* Leidy, 1852 and its substitution for the well-known name *Choeropsis* Leidy, 1852 do not appear to be in the best interests of stability and universality of the zoological nomenclature.

7. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is therefore requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Choerodes* Leidy, 1852 for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;

(2) to place the generic name *Choeropsis* Leidy, 1852 (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Hippopotamus liberiensis* Morton, 1849, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *liberiensis* Morton, 1849, as published in the binomen *Hippopotamus liberiensis* (specific name of the type species of *Choeropsis* Leidy, 1852), on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the generic name *Choerodes* Leidy, 1852, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

CORBET, G. B. 1969. The taxonomic status of the pygmy hippopotamus, *Choeropsis liberiensis*, from the Niger delta. *J. Zool., Lond.* vol. 158(3), pp. 387–394.

CRISTINO, J. J. DE SA E MELO 1958. Statut des ongulés en Guinée Portugaise. *Mammalia* vol. 22, pp. 387–389.

DESMAREST, A. G. 1822. *Mammalogie ou description des espèces de Mammifères. Partie 2, contenant les ordres des Rongeurs, des Edentés, des Pachydermes, des Ruminans et des Cétacés.* Paris, pp. 277–555.

LEIDY, J. 1852a. [Some remarks upon the comparative osteology and dentition of the *Hippopotamus*]. *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia*, vol. 6, p. 52.

———1852b. On the osteology of the head of *Hippopotamus*, and a description of the osteological characters of a new genus of Hippopotamidae. *J. Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia*, (2), vol. 2, pp. 207–224.

MACALISTER, A. 1873. The anatomy of *Chaeropsis liberiensis. Proc. R. Ir. Acad.* (2) vol. 1, pp. 494–500.

MILNE-EDWARDS, M. A. 1868. Observations sur l'hippopotame de Libéria, pp. 43–66 in MILNE-EDWARDS, H. 1868–1874, *Recherches pour servir à l'histoire naturelle des mammifères.* Paris (Masson), 394 pp.

MORTON, S. G. 1844. On a supposed new species of *Hippopotamus. Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia,* vol. 2, pp. 14–17.

———1849. Additional observations on a new living species of *Hippopotamus. J. Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia,* (2) vol. 1, pp. 231–239.

OLIVIER, R. C. D. 1975. Aspects of skin physiology in the pigmy hippopotamus *Choeropsis liberiensis. J. Zool., Lond.* vol. 176, pp. 211–213.

RITCHIE, J. 1930. Distribution of the pigmy hippopotamus. *Nature* vol. 126, pp. 204–205.

SABAN, R. 1971. La musculature peaucière de la tête et du cou chez *Hippopotamus amphibius* L. 1758. *Gegenbaurs Morph. Jahrb.* vol. 116(3), pp. 303–321.

SIDNEY, J. 1965. The past and present distribution of some African ungulates. *Trans. zool. Soc. Lond.* vol. 30, pp. 1–396.

WALKER, E. P. 1975. *Mammals of the World* (3rd edn.) Volume 2. Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, Baltimore, pp. 647–1500.

WHITE, A. & BUTLER, A. G. 1846. *Zoology of the Voyage of H.M.S. Erebus and Terror; Insects.* Janson, London, 24pp.

CENTRURUS LIMPIDUS KARSCH, 1879 AND *CENTRUROIDES ORNATUS* POCOCK, 1902 (ARACHNIDA, SCORPIONES): PROPOSED CONSERVATION. Z.N.(S.)2446

By Oscar F. Francke (*Department of Biological Sciences and The Museum, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas 79409, U.S.A.*)

The objective of this request is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers to suppress a specific name because of the confusion that the adoption of the name would create, and because it has not been used as a valid name for more than 100 years.

2. Thorell, 1877, pp. 151–152 described *Centrurus olivaceus* and stated that: 'Patria: America Septentrionalis. Exempla pauca siccata, ex California, in Mus. Holm. asservata examinavi.' The collector of the specimens is not known.

3. The generic name *Centrurus* Ehrenberg, 1828, is a nomen nudum (Pocock, 1902b), but the name is available under Article 16a(v) of the Code from C. L. Koch, 1838 who described the single new species *C. galbineus*.

4. The combination *Centrurus olivaceus* has not been mentioned in the literature since Thorell's original description.

5. The combination *Centruroides olivaceus* (Thorell), has been mentioned in the literature only three times since 1877, and none of these constitutes usage in the meaning of Article 79b; (a) Kraepelin (1899) included *C. olivaceus* as a questionable synonym of *Centruroides infamatus* (C. L. Koch,. 1845), from west-central Mexico; (b) Pocock (1902a) and (c) Stahnke & Calos (1977) placed *C. olivaceus* as a questionable synonymn of *Centruroides vittatus* (Say, 1821), from the southeastern United States.

6. Five dried, pinned specimens of *C. olivaceus* studied by Thorell are deposited in the Naturhistoriska Riksmuseet in Stockholm. They represent two different species of *Centruroides*, neither of which is known to occur in California.

7. The larger of the syntypes, an adult female with a carapace length of 6·0 mm, is missing both pedipalp chelae and the telson; both pedipalp tibiae, metasomal segment V, and the pectines are severely mutilated. Nonetheless, it is identifiable as being conspecific with *Centruroides limpidus* (Karsch, 1879). Hoffman (1932) recognized two subspecies of *C. limpidus*: the nominate subspecies and *C. limpidus tecomanus* Hoffman, 1932, separable primarily by the extent of development of the subaculear tubercle in adults. Since the syntype of *C. olivaceus* under consideration lacks the telson, it is not possible to assign it to a subspecific taxon.

8. *Centruroides limpidus* (sensu lato) is considered to be one of the dangerous scorpions to man because of the toxicity of its venom (Keegan, 1980), and the name has been used repeatedly in the literature. The following references from the last 50 years serve as examples, and satisfy the requirements of Article 79b: Hoffman, 1932 (taxonomy), Hoffman, 1938 (geographic distribution), Hoffman & Nieto Roaro, 1939 (venoms), Sergent, 1949 (venoms), del Pozo, 1949 (venoms), Baerg, 1961 (medical importance), Monroy Velazco & Monroy Nieto, 1961 (general), Glenn *et al,* 1962 (venoms), Mazzotti, 1963a, 1963b, 1964, 1966, 1973 (biology), Mazzotti *et al.,* 1961 (effects of gamma radiation), Whittemore & Keegan, 1963 (medical importance), Diaz-Najera, 1964 (distribution), Diaz-Najera, 1966 (general), Diaz-Najera, 1975 (distribution), Bucherl, 1971 (venoms), Wheeling & Keegan, 1972 (venoms), Stahnke & Calos, 1977 (identification), Keegan, 1980 (medical importance).

9. The other four syntypes of *C. olivaceus* represent three adult females (carapace lengths of 5·5, 5·2, and 4·9 mm respectively), and a juvenile male (carapace length 3·8 mm), and are referable to *Centruroides ornatus* Pocock, 1902.

10. Most authors consider *C. ornatus* to be a subspecies of *Centruroides infamatus* (C. L. Koch, 1845), and both the nominate subspecies and *C. i. ornatus,* are also of considerable medical importance. The epithet *ornatus,* either in a binominal or a trinominal combination, has been used sufficiently in the past 50 years to satisfy Article 79b. Examples are: Hoffman, 1932 (taxonomy), Hoffman, 1938 (geographic distribution), Monroy Velazco & Monroy Nieto, 1961 (general), Diaz-Najera, 1964 and 1975 (distribution), Diaz-Najera, 1966 (general), Bucherl, 1971 (medical importance), Stahnke & Calos, 1977 (identification), and Keegan, 1980 (general). The suppression of nomina dubia is not a desirable course of action in most cases; once the underlying circumstances have been explained, most such names can be left on one side, since it is clear that they cannot be interpreted unless a neotype is designated. But that may not always be a desirable or (as here—see Article 75b, *olivaceus* is not in general use—) a legitimate course. Moreover, the name is a potential threat to the stability of the names of four subspecies of medical importance. On these grounds its suppression is clearly desirable.

11. I therefore ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:

(i) to use its plenary powers to suppress the specific name *olivaceus* Thorell, 1877, as published in the binomen *Centrurus olivaceus,* for the purposes of the Law of Priority, but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;

(ii) to place the following specific names:

a. *limpidus* Karsch, 1879, as published in the binomen *Centrurus limpidus,* and

b. *ornatus* Pocock, 1902, as published in the binomen *Centruroides ornatus*, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(iii) to place the name *olivaceus* Thorell, 1877, as published in the binomen *Centrurus olivaceus*, and as suppressed by use of the plenary powers in (i) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

BAERG, W. J. 1961. Scorpions: Biology and effect of their venom. *Arkansas Agr. Expt. Stat. Bull.* No. 649, 34 pp.

BÜCHERL, W. 1971. Classification, Biology, and Venom Extraction of Scorpions. Vol. III, pp. 317–347, in *Venomous Animals and their Venoms*. Bücherl, W. & Buckley, E. R. (eds.). Academic Press, New York.

DIAZ-NÁJERA, A. 1964. Alacranes de la Republica Mexicana. Identificación de ejemplares capturados en 235 localidades. *Rev. Inst. Salubr. Enferm. Trop. México*, vol. 24, pp. 15–30.

——1966. Alacranes de la Republica Mexicana. Clave para identificar especies de *Centrurus* (Scorpionida, Buthidae). *Rev. Invest. Salud. Publ. México*, vol. 26, pp. 109–123.

——1975. Listas y datos de distributión geográfica de los alacranes de México. *Rev. Invest. Salud Publ. México*, vol. 35, pp. 1–36.

EHRENBERG, C. G. 1828. *Symbolae physicae seu Icones et descriptiones Animalium Evertebratorum... (Arachnoidea*, pp. 115–126, 2 pls.). *ex* Officina Academica, Berolini.

GLENN, W. G., KEEGAN, H. L. & WHITTEMORE, F. W. 1962. Intergeneric relationships among various scorpion venoms and antivenins. *Science* No. 135, pp. 434–435.

HOFFMANN, C. C. 1932. Monografias para la Entomología Médica de México. Monografía No. 2, Los Scorpiones de México. Segunda Parte: Buthidae. *An. Inst. Biol. México*, vol. 3, pp. 243–361.

——1938. Nuevas consideraciones acerca de los alacranes de México. *An. Inst. Biol. México*, vol. 9, pp. 317–337.

—— & NIETO ROARO, D. 1939. Segunda contribución al conocimiento de los venenos de los alacranes mexicanos. *An. Inst. Biol. México*, vol. 10, pp. 83–92.

KARSCH, K. 1879. Skorpionologische Beiträge II. *Mitt. Muench. entomol. Ver.*, vol. 3, p. 120.

KEEGAN, H. L. 1980. Scorpions of Medical Importance. *Univ. Press Mississippi*, Jackson, Miss. 140 pp.

KOCH, C. L. 1838. *Die Arachniden*. Nürnberg, vol. 4, p. 110.

——1845. *Die Arachniden*. Nürnberg, vol. 11, 174 pp.

KRAEPELIN, K. 1899. Skorpiones und Pedipalpi. *Das Tierreich*, vol. 8, pp. 1–265.

MARX, G. 1889. Arachnida. Scientific results of explorations by the U.S. Fish Commission Steamer 'Albatros'. *Proc. U.S. Natl. Mus.*, vol. 12, pp. 207–211.

MAZZOTTI, L. 1963a. Descripción del espermatóforo de la especie *Centruroides limpidus*. *Rev. Inst. Salubr. Enferm. Trop. México*, vol. 23, pp. 57–59.

——1963b. Resistencia de los alacranes a la sumersión en agua. *Rev. Inst. Salubr. Enferm. Trop. México*, vol. 23, pp. 181–183.

——1964. Enemigos de los alacranes. *Rev. Inst. Salubr. Enferm. Trop. México*, vol. 24, pp. 9–10.

——1966. Estudio sobre los enemigos naturales de los alacranes. *Rev. Inst. Salud. Publ. México*, vol. 26 pp. 51–55.

——1973. Enemigos de los escorpiones: dos especies de aves de la America tropical (Tucanes). *Ann. Parasitol.* (Paris) vol. 48, pp. 351–353.

—— RHODES, R. H., LOPEZ, F. & TELICH, J. 1961. Radiación con rayos gamma de escorpiones de la especie *Centruroides limpidus*. *Rev. Inst. Salubr. Enferm. Trop. México*, vol. 21, pp. 125–127.

MONROY VELAZCO, J. & MONROY NIETO, J. M. 1961. Alacranes venenosos de Mexico. Sistemática y distribución geográfica. Morfología Biología. Veneno, Sintomatología. *Rev. Mexicana Cien. Med. Biol.*, 2a Época. Nos. 1–6, 30 pp.

POCOCK, R. I. 1902a. Arachnida: Scorpiones, Pedipalpi, and Solifugae. *Biologia Centrali-Americana*. Francis & Taylor, London, p. 26.

——1902b. A contribution to the systematics of Scorpions. *Ann. and Mag. Nat. Hist.* ser. 7, vol. 10, pp. 364–380.

POZO, E. C. DEL 1949. Ressemblances et différences dans les actions physiologiques des venins des scorpions. *Arch. Inst. Pasteur Algiers*, vol. 27, pp. 35–39.

SAY, T. 1821. An account of the Arachnides of the United States. *J. Philadelphia Acad. Nat. Sci.*, vol. 1, pp. 59–65.

SERGENT, E. 1949. Étude comparative du venin de scorpions mexicains et de scorpions nord-africains. *Arch. Inst. Pasteur Algiers*. vol. 27, pp. 31–34.

STAHNKE, H. L. & CALOS, M. 1977. A key to the species of the genus *Centruroides* Marx (Scorpiones: Buthidae). *Entomol. News*, vol. 88, pp. 111–120

THORELL, T. 1877. Études Scorpiologiques. *Atti Soc. Italiana Sci. Nat.*, vol. 19, pp. 75–272.

WHEELING, C. H. & KEEGAN, H. L. 1972. Effects of a scorpion venom on a tarantula. *Toxicon*, vol. 10, pp. 305–306.

WHITTEMORE, F. W. & KEEGAN, H. L. 1963. Medically important scorpions in the Pacific region. Pp. 107–110, in *Venomous and Poisonous Animals and Noxious Plants of the Pacific Region*, Keegan, H. L. & MacFarlane, W. V. (eds.). Pergamon Press, New York.

LEUCASPIS SIGNORET, 1869 (INSECTA, HOMOPTERA, DIASPIDIDAE): PROPOSED CONSERVATION BY THE SUPPRESSION OF *LEUCASPIS* BURMEISTER, 1835 (INSECTA, HYMENOPTERA, LEUCOSPIDAE). Z.N.(S.)2448

By E. M. Danzig and I. M. Kerzhner (*Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad, USSR*)

Walker, 1834, p. 13, in discussing the genus *Leucospis* Fabricius, 1775, said in a footnote: 'λευκὸς albus, ὄψις facies. I think with Dumeril [sic] that the name of the genus is derived from these words.'

2. Burmeister, 1835, p. 47, in reviewing Walker's 1834 paper, said in a footnote that the generic name is formed from the Greek 'leucos' and 'aspis' and should be spelled *Leucaspis*. *Leucaspis* Burmeister, 1835, is clearly an unjustified emendation of *Leucospis* and therefore an available name. To our knowledge, *Leucaspis* Burmeister is practically never used now by hymenopterologists as a valid name (see also Morrison & Morrison, 1866, pp. 108–109).

3. Targioni-Tozzetti, 1868, p. 41, also 1869, p. 734) listed in a catalogue of scale insects '*Leucaspis* nob. Gen. n.' with two species, *L. candida* and *L. signoreti*, both nomina nuda. The name *Leucaspis* is here clearly a nomen nudum, although it is common practice to credit the name to 'Targioni-Tozzetti, 1868'.

4. Signoret, 1869a, 14 April, p. 865, listed *Leucaspis* with *pini* Hartig and the reference '*C. pini* Hart. Jahr. über die Forsh. des Forstwess. (1839), 642'. Despite some errors in this reference ('*C*[*occus*]' instead of *Aspidiotus*, 'Forsh.' for 'Fortschritte' and so on) it is an unambiguous reference to *Aspidiotus pini* Hartig, 1839, p. 642. This indication (Code, Article 16a(v)) makes the name *Leucaspis* available. The name is to be credited to Signoret, 1869 and the type species, by monotypy, is *Aspidiotus pini* Hartig (the other specific name cited in combination with *Leucaspis*, on p. 872, was '*L. signoreti* Targioni, 1868' at that time a nomen nudum).

5. Accepting *Leucaspis* Signoret, 1869 as preoccupied by *Leucaspis* Burmeister, 1835, Kirkaldy, 1904, p. 257, replaced the junior homonym by '*Leucodiaspis* Signoret, 1869'. This spelling in Signoret's work (1869b, p. 99) was certainly a lapsus calami for *Leucaspis*, because it is not indicated as an emendation and is not accepted in later parts of Signoret's work. *Leucodiaspis* should be credited to Kirkaldy, 1904, because he made the name available by using it as a replacement name. Although some authors (Lindinger, Zimmermann, Zahradnik) followed Kirkaldy, a large majority of coccidologists still use *Leucaspis*. Williams

(1969, p. 330) indicated that an application must be made to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for the conservation of *Leucaspis* in scale insects.

6. The genus *Leucaspis* Signoret includes nine mostly European or Mediterranean species, some of them economically important as pests of pine. It is the type genus of the subfamily LEUCASPIDINAE Atkinson, 1886, pp. 271, 273–274 (as 'Leucaspiaria').

7. An additional problem is the identity of *Aspidiotus pini* Hartig, the type species of *Leucaspis* Signoret. Hartig (1839, p. 642) described two new species of *Aspidiotus* injurious to pine in Germany, but he mixed up the sexes (a possibility that he himself did not exclude). It is clear from his original descriptions that

> *A. pini* Hartig = *Leucaspis sp.* male + *Nuculaspis abietis* (Schrank, 1776), female;
> *A. flavus* Hartig = *Nuculaspis abietis* male + *Leucaspis sp.* female.

Those parts of the descriptions that are based on *Leucaspis sp.* fit two or three species of this genus occurring in Germany (Lindinger, 1906). Nothing is known of the fate of Hartig's scale-insect material and it is most probable that it is all lost. Enquiries were made of two institutions (Forstliche Hochschule, Eberswalde, DDR and Zoologisches Museum, Munich, BRD) which, at least before World War II had some remnants of Hartig's collections of insects in other groups, but no answer was received from Eberswalde and none of Hartig's scale-insect material was found in Munich (Dr M. Baehr, in correspondence).

8. In 1870 Signoret published a detailed description of *Leucaspis pini* Hartig. The name has been used consistently since then for the same species by nearly all authors, including those of the latest monographs (Balachowsky, 1953; Borchsenius, 1966). Another point of view (Lindinger, 1906; 1943) is that *Aspidiotus pini* Hartig should be treated as a nomen dubium in *Leucaspis* and that the species named *L. pini* by Signoret should receive another name. Morrison & Morrison, 1966, p. 109, said 'it seems preferable to fix the Hartig name in this [generally accepted] status'.

9. For this purpose we here designate a neotype of *Aspidiotus pini* Hartig, a female surrounded by a black circle in a preparation labelled 'Germania: Triglitz, Pinus sylvestris, 10.IV.09' and preserved in the Zoological Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., Leningrad. A corresponding neotype label will be added after publication. Triglitz is about 100 km from Berlin, in the vicinity of which Hartig apparently collected his material. A female (not a male) is proposed as neotype because modern taxonomy of the scale insects is based on females.

10. In accordance with the above, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Leucaspis* Burmeister, 1835 and all uses of that name prior to its use by Signoret, 1869, for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy;

(2) to place the generic name *Leucaspis* Signoret, 1869 (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Aspidiotus pini* Hartig, 1839, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *pini* Hartig, 1839, as published in the binomen *Aspidiotus pini* (specific name of type species of *Leucaspis* Signoret, 1869) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the family-group name LEUCASPIDINAE Atkinson, 1886 (as 'Leucaspiaria') (type genus *Leucaspis* Signoret, 1869) on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology;

(5) to place the name *Leucaspis* Burmeister, 1835 as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

ATKINSON, E. T. 1886. On the homopterous family Coccidae. *J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal.* vol. 55, pp. 267–298.

BALACHOWSKY, A. 1953. *Les cochenilles de France, d'Europe, du nord de l'Afrique, et du bassin mediterranéen.* vol. 7, pp. 735–929. Paris.

BORCHSENIUS, N. S. 1966. *A catalogue of the armoured scale insects (Diaspidoidea) of the world.* 499 pp. Moscow and Leningrad.

BURMEISTER, H. 1835. Bericht über die Fortschritte der Entomologie im Jahre 1834. *Arch. Naturgesch.*, Jahrg. 1, Bd. 2, pp. 7–74.

HARTIG, T. 1839. *Jahresberichte über die Fortschritte der Forstwissenschaft und forstlichen Naturkunde im Jahre 1836 und 1837 nebst Original-Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiete dieser Wissenschaften.* Jahrg. 1, Heft 4, pp. 640–646.

KIRKALDY, G. W. 1904. Bibliographical notes on the Hemiptera, No. 11. *Entomologist*, vol. 37, pp. 254–258.

LINDINGER, L. 1906. Die Schildlausgattung *Leucaspis. Jahrb. Hamb. wiss. Anst.*, vol. 23 (1905), Beiheft 3 (*Hamburg. bot Staatsint., Abt. Pflanzenschutz*, 8), 60 pp.

——— 1943. Verzeichnis der Schildlaus-Gattungen, I. Nachtrag, (Homoptera Coccoidea). *Z. wien. entomol. Ges.*, vol. 28, pp. 217–224.

MORRISON, H. & MORRISON, E. R. 1966. An annotated list of generic names of the scale insects. *U.S. Dept. Agric. misc. publ.* No. 1015, 206 pp.

SIGNORET, V. 1869a. Essai sur les cochenilles (Homoptères-Coccides), 2e partie. *Ann. Soc. entomol. France* (4) vol. 8, pp. 829–876.

——— 1869b. Ditto, 3e partie. *Ibid.* vol. 9, pp. 97–104.

——— 1870. Ditto, 6e partie. *Ibid.* vol. 10, pp. 91–110.

TARGIONI-TOZZETTI, A. 1868. Introduzione alla seconda memoria per gli studi sulle cocciniglie, e catalogo dei generi e delle specie della famiglia dei Coccidi. *Atti Soc. ital. Sci. nat.* vol. 11 for 1869, pp. 694–738.

WALKER, F. 1834. Monographia Chalciditum (continued). *Entomol. Mag.* vol. 2, pp. 13–39.

WILLIAMS, D. J. 1969. The family-group names of the scale insects. *Bull. brit. Mus. (nat. Hist.)* Entomol., vol. 23, no. 8, pp. 315–341.

TOMIOPSIS BENEDIKTOVA, 1956 (SPIRIFERIDA, BRACHIOPODA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.)2451

By N. W. Archbold and G. A. Thomas (*Department of Geology, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria, Australia 3052*).

E. D. Cope (1893, *Proc. Amer. Phil. Soc.*, vol. 31, pp. 317–318) proposed the name *Tomiopsis* for a genus of fossil edentate mammal, of Tertiary age, with type species *T. ferruminatus* Cope, 1893 (by original designation), based on a single tooth from the 'Neocene?' (sic) of the Lapara Creek in Western Texas, U.S.A.

2. R. N. Benediktova (1956, *Voprosy Geologii Kuzbassa*, I, *Materialy Vtorogo Soveshchaniya po Stratigrafii Uglenosnykh Otlozhenii*, pp. 169–174) proposed the name *Tomiopsis* for a genus of fossil spiriferid brachiopod, of Carboniferous age, with type species *Brachythyris kumpani* Yanischevsky (1935, *Uchenye Zapiski Leningrad. Gosud. Un-ta, Vyp.* 1, pp 68–69, by original designation).

3. R. A. Doescher (1981, *Smithson. Contrib. Paleobiol.*, No. 42, p. 40) noted that *Tomiopsis* Benediktova (1956) is pre-occupied by *Tomiopsis* Cope (1893) and hence is a junior homonym, but he did not propose a replacement name.

4. Since 1893, the name *Tomiopsis* Cope has not been used for a redescription or discussion of Cope's genus and no additional species have been referred to the genus. The name has been listed in the following indices:

(1) Hay, I. P. 1902. *Bull. U.S. geol. Surv.*, vol. 179, p. 581;
(2) Waterhouse, C. O. 1902 *Index Zoologicus* (Zoological Record Index Volume, 1880–1900, p. 378);
(3) Palmer, T. S. 1904 *Index Generum Mammalium*. A list of the genera and families of mammals. N.A. Fauna, No. XXIII, pp. 682, 822;
(4) Montgomery, T. H. 1904. *Biol. Bull.*, vol. 8, p. 57.
(5) Hay, O. P. 1930. *Publ. Carnegie Inst.*, 390, vol. 2, p. 417;
(6) Neave, S. A. 1940. *Nomenclator Zoologicus*, vol. 4, p. 506.

5. Since 1956 the name *Tomiopsis* Benediktova has been widely used in the palaeontological literature as a valid name for a brachiopod taxon, both in comparisons with other genera and with the description of additional species. The name is now well established for a widely distributed Carboniferous and Permian brachiopod genus. Significant publications that contain discussions of the genus and/or the description of species include:

(1) Sokolskaya, A. N. 1959. *Paleont. Zhur.*, No. 1, pp. 59–67;
(2) Sokolskaya, A. N. 1962. *Trudy Sib. nauchno-issled. In-ta Geol. Geofiz. i. Mineral. Syr'ya* (SNIIGGIMS), Vyp. 21, Tom 3, pp. 177–178;

(3) Ustritskiy, V. I. & Chernyak, G. E. 1963. *Trudy nauchno-issled. In-ta Geol. Arktiki* (NIIGA), vol. 134, pp. 118–119;
(4) Sarycheva, T. G., Sokolskaya, A. N., Beznosova, G. A. & Maximova, S. W. 1963. *Trudy Paleont. In-ta, Akad-Nauk SSSR*, Vyp. 95, pp. 306–308;
(5) Waterhouse, J. B. 1965. *Trans. roy. Soc. New Zealand, Geol.* vol. 3 (12), p. 169;
(6) Pitrat, C. W. 1965. *Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology* (R. C. Moore, ed.), part H, vol. 2, p. 727;
(7) Kotlyar, G. V. & Popeko, L. I. 1967. *Zapiski Zabaikal. Fil. Geog. Ob-va SSSR*, Vyp. 28, *Trudy otdel. geol.*, Vyp. 5, pp. 185–195;
(8) Kotlyar, G. V. 1968. *Ezheg. Vses. Paleont. Ob-va*, Tom 18, pp. 225–234;
(9) Czarniecki, S. 1969. *Prace Museum Ziemi*, vol. 16, pp. 309–311;
(10) Waterhouse, J. B. 1971. *J. Paleont.*, vol. 45, pp. 68–80.
(11) Zavodovsky, V. M. & Stepanov, D. L. 1971. *In. Polevoi Atlas Permskoi Fauny i Flory Severo-Vostoka* SSSR, pp. 175–177;
(12) Termier, G., Termier, H., Lapparent, A. F. de & Marin, P. 1974. *Doc. Lab. Geol., Fac. Sci., Lyon, H.S.*, vol. 2, pp. 70–74;
(13) Lee, Li & Ku Feng, 1976. *In*, A Pictorial Handbook of Palaeontology for Northern China; Inner Mongolia Section, Part 1, Palaeozoic Section. Geol. Publ. House, Peking, p. 302;
(14) Waterhouse, J. B. & Mutch, A. R. 1978. *New Zealand J. Geol. Geophys.*, vol. 21, pp. 521–522;
(15) Waterhouse, J. B. 1978. *Palaeontographica*, Abt. A, vol. 160, p. 58;
(16) Kalashnikov, N. V. 1980. *Brakhiopody Verkhnego Paleozoya Evropeiskogo Severa SSSR*. 'Nauka', Leningrad, pp. 97–98;

6. We believe that the interests of stability in nomenclature would be best served by the conservation of the name *Tomiopsis* Benediktova, 1956 by exercise of the plenary powers.

7. We therefore ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Tomiopsis* Cope, 1893, and all uses of that name prior to its use by Benediktova in 1956, for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy;
(2) to place the generic name *Tomiopsis* Benediktova, 1956, (gender: feminine) type species, by original designation,

Brachythyris kumpani Yanischevsky, 1935, as conserved by the use of the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *kumpani* Yanischevsky, 1935, as published in the binomen *Brachythyris kumpani* (specific name of type species of *Tomiopsis* Benediktova, 1956) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the generic name *Tomiopsis* Cope, 1893, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology;

8. We are indebted to Dr T. Rich, Curator of Vertebrate Palaeontology, Museum of Victoria, for his assistance regarding the use of the name *Tomiopsis* Cope, 1893.

CAECILIIDAE IN AMPHIBIA AND INSECTA (PSOCOPTERA): ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS TO REMOVE THE HOMONYMY. Z.N.(S.)2333

(see vol. 40, pp. 124–128)

By Hobart M. Smith (*Department of Environmental, Population and Organismic Biology*) and John T. Polhemus (*Associate in Entomology, Museum, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309, U.S.A.*)

It is strange that this problem of family–group name homonymy has been known for so long (since 1929) without definitive resolution, in view of the repeated efforts by entomologists to remove the homonymy.

We thus support enthusiastically this proposal to dispose of the problem officially and definitively. Our only suggestion is that the desirability be considered of keeping the changed family name as closely corresponding to the spelling of its type genus as possible, not only to promote ease of association but also to minimise implication of existence of a nominal type genus that in fact does not exist.

That is to say, the nominal type-genera of the two families *are* different, as they would have to be: *Caecilia* of amphibians, *Caecilius* of insects. It would be useful for the changed family name to reflect the difference. Additionally, there is no nominal genus *Caecilionis* (or *-us,* or *-a*), which is to some extent implied by a rendition of the changed family name as CAECILIONIDAE, and proposal of that generic name in the future, for any group of animals, would forever be at least strongly contraindicated, although sure to be unwitting since the name would not be listed in any index as occupied.

For these reasons we suggest that a family name change of clearer and more proper correlation with type genus than CAECILIONIDAE, based on *Caecilius,* would be CAECILIAIDAE, based on *Caecilia.* That alternative would leave the automatically properly formed and familiar name CAECILIIDAE for the insect family, and since that family is large and widely distributed there is no reason on grounds of 'significance' to seek to preserve the familiar family name for the amphibian group rather than the insect group. Furthermore, a family name created from the entire name *Caecilia* is much more euphonious than one from *Caecilius* (viz., CAECILIUSIDAE).

Finally, the anglicized vernacular for members of the insect family would be spared the necessity of rendition as 'caecilionids', remaining as 'caeciliids', while the members of the amphibian family would need only an insignificant change in their vernacular, viz. 'caeciliaids'. In this context it might be wished that Gray's original orthography (CAECILIADAE, hence 'caeciliads') be accepted as correct by use of the plenary powers of the Commission, as a uniquely condoned exception to Art. 29 of the Code.

Assuming that such an exception would never be approved, we accordingly suggest that as an alternative to the previous proposal number (1) that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature use its plenary powers to rule that the stem of *Caecilia* Linnaeus, 1758, for the purposes of Art. 29, is *Caecilia,* thereby creating for it the family name CAECILIAIDAE. If approved, the original proposals under headings number (2) and (3) would remain with our endorsement, but those under heading (4), replacement of names on the Official List of Family–Group Names in Zoology, would have to be changed as follows:

(a) CAECILIIDAE (ex CAECILIINI) Kolbe, 1880 (type genus *Caecilius* Curtis, 1837); and

(b) CAECILIAIDAE (ex CAECILIADAE) Gray, 1825 (type genus *Caecilia* Linnaeus, 1758).

Likewise the proposal number (5) would be altered to read:

to place the family–group name CAECILIADAE Gray, 1825 (an incorrect original spelling of CAECILIAIDAE through the ruling under the plenary powers in (1) above) on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family–Group Names in Zoology.

LASPEYRESIA HÜBNER, [1825], (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION BY THE SUPPRESSION OF *CYDIA* HÜBNER, [1825]. Z.N.(S.)2421

By V. I. Kuznetsov and I. M. Kerzhner (*Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad, Leningrad 199164, USSR*)

Laspeyresia Hübner, [1825], pl. 45, p. 381 (type species *Tortrix corollana* Hübner, 1823, by subsequent designation by Fernald, 1908, p. 10) is the name commonly used for a genus of tortricid moths containing more than a hundred species and having nearly worldwide distribution. The genus includes many species of economic importance, among them the codling moth, *L. pomonella* (Linnaeus, 1758), the most important pest of apples. The literature on this genus is very voluminous and includes thousands of papers and monographs on this species.

2. *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825] is a junior homonym of *Laspeyresia* R.L., 1817, p. 288, an unjustified emendation of *Laspeyria* Germar, 1810 (Lepidoptera, NOCTUIDAE) (both names were coined to honour J. H. Laspeyres, a German lepidopterist). *Laspeyresia* R.L., 1817 seems never to have been used as a valid name in noctuids.

3. *Cydia* Hübner, [1825] (type species, by subsequent designation by Walsingham, 1897, p. 130, *Phalaena pomonella* Linnaeus, 1758, p. 538) is a subjective synonym of *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825]. Both names were published in the same work and their relative precedence was established by Kennel, 1908, pp. 49–50. Kennel, in discussing the problem of the correct name for the genus in question, rejected *Cydia* as having been used for a different genus and accepted *Laspeyresia* as the valid name. The corresponding text is as follows (some words omitted):

'Schwieriger . . . ist das Auffinden des für die Gattung gültigen ältesten Namens. Bei Hübner (1826) [i.e. [1825]] kommen Vertreter derselben in 6 verschiedenen Gattungen vor: *Enarmonia, Cydia, Epinotia, Hemimene, Pammene, Laspeyresia.* Der "älteste Name wäre *Enarmonia* . . . Meyrick aber . . . gebraucht den Namen *Enarmonia* für eine andere Gruppe und ihm folgt Walsingham . . . Dadurch wird dieser älteste Name für unsere Gattung unbrauchbar. Dasselbe gilt für den Namen *Cydia* Hb . . . Meyrick hat vorher schon den Namen für eine andere Gattung verwendet, die im wesentlichen, aber nicht ganz, der Gattung *Semasia* (H.-S.) Reb. entspricht; diese Doppelverwendung verbietet die weitere Benützung für unsere Gruppe. *Epinotia, Hemimene* und *Pammene* sind gleichfalls anderweitig verwandt und so bleibt denn noch *Laspeyresia* . . . ich nenne die Gattung *Laspeyresia* (Hb.) Ken.'

4. Brown, 1979, p. 565, wrongly regarded as first reviser Walsingham, 1914, pp. 258–259, who did the reverse and regarded *Laspeyresia* as a junior synonym of *Cydia.*

5. The generic name *Carpocapsa* Treitschke, 1829, p. 231 (type species *Phalaena pomonella* Linnaeus, 1758 (as *pomonana* Denis & Schiffermüller, an unjustified emendation) by subsequent designation by Curtis, 1831, folio 352) is a junior objective synonym of *Cydia.* It was widely used for this genus in the 19th century and is still sometimes used today.

6. *L. corollana* and *L. pomonella,* the type species of *Laspeyresia* and *Cydia* respectively, belong to the same subgenus although in different species groups or sections (Danilevsky & Kuznetsov, 1968).

7. Kennel's acceptance of *Laspeyresia* was followed in taxonomic monographs (Heinrich, 1926; Benander, 1950; Van Deurs, 1956; Obraztsov, 1959; Danilevsky & Kuznetsov, 1968; Bentinck & Diakonoff, 1968; Kuznetsov, 1978, etc.) and in many works dealing with economic importance, control, physiology, etc. *Carpocapsa* is gradually fading from usage, although occasional uses of it can still be traced today.

8. Bradley, 1972, because of the homonymy of *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825] with *Laspeyresia* R.L., 1817, rejected the first name in favour of *Cydia.* He was followed by Razowsky, 1976, 1977; Bradley, Tremewan & Smith, 1979, and by some other authors. *Cydia* has been adopted by the Commonwealth Institute of Entomology. Brown, 1979, advocated the use of *Cydia* on account of the incorrect acceptance of Walsingham as first reviser.

9. According to Brown, 1979, the Abstracts of Entomology listed 252 uses of *Laspeyresia,* 42 of *Cydia* and 30 of *Carpocapsa* between January 1974 and July 1978. This is clear evidence that *Laspeyresia* dominates even in recent years. In order to conserve this usage the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked to:

(1) use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Laspeyresia* R.L., 1817, and all uses of that name prior to its use by Hübner, [1825], for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonomy;

(2) place the generic name *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825] (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Fernald, 1908, *Tortrix corollana* Hübner, 1823, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) place the specific name *corollana* Hübner, 1823, as published in the binomen *Tortrix corollana* (specific name of type species of *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825]) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) place the generic name *Laspeyresia* R.L., 1817, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

BENANDER, F. 1950. Vecklarfjärilar, Tortricina. In *Svensk Insectenfauna*, vol. 39, Fjärilar, Lepidoptera, pt 10, 173 pp., 9 pls, Stockholm.

BENTINCK, G. A. & DIAKONOFF, A. 1968. De Nederlandse Bladrollers (Tortricidae). *Monogr. nederl. entomol. Ver.*, No. 3, 201 pp., 99 pls.

BRADLEY, J. P. 1972. Lepidoptera, in Kloet & Hincks, *A check list of British Insects*, 2nd edit., *Handb. Ident. brit. Ins.* vol. 2 (2), viii + 153 pp.

——, TREMEWAN, W. G. & SMITH, A. 1979. *British tortricid moths*, Tortricidae, Olethreutinae, viii + 336 pp., 43 pls. London.

BROWN, R. L. 1979. The valid generic and tribal names for the Codling Moth, *Cydia pomonella* (Olethreutinae, Tortricidae). *Ann. entomol. Soc. America*, vol. 72 no. 4, pp. 565–567.

CURTIS, J. 1831. *British Entomology*, vol. 8, fol. 338–385. London.

DANILEVSKY, A. S. & KUZNETSOV, V. I. 1968. Listovertki (Tortricidae). Triba plodozhorki Laspeyresiini. *Fauna SSSR* n.s. no. 98, Nasekomye tsheshuekrylye, vol. 5, pt. 1, 635 pp. Leningrad.

[DENIS, M. & SCHIFFERMÜLLER, I.], 1775. *Systematisches Verzeichniss der Schmetterlinge der Wienergegend*, 322 + 1 pp. Vienna.

FERNALD, C. H. 1908. *The genera of the Tortricidae and their types*, 62 pp. Amherst, Mass.

HANNEMANN, H. J. 1961. Kleinschmetterlinge oder Microlepidoptera. 1, die Wickler (s. str), Tortricidae. In *Die Tierwelt Deutschlands*, pt 48, 233 pp. 22 pls, Jena.

HEINRICH, C. 1926. Revision of the North American moths of the subfamilies Laspeyresiinae and Olethreutinae. *Bull. U.S. nat. Mus.* no. 132, v + 207 pp., 76 pls.

HÜBNER, J. 1823. *Sammlung europäischer Schmetterlinge*, Tortrices.

—— [1825]. *Verzeichniss bekannter Schmett.*, Heft 24.

KENNEL, J. VON 1908–1921. Die palaearktischen Tortriciden. *Zoologica* (Stuttgart), vol. 21, pt. 54, 742 pp., 24 pls (pp. 1–100, 1908).

KUZNETSOV, V. I. 1978. 21 Sem. Tortricidae (Olethreutidae, Cochylidae)—listovertki, in *Opredelitel nasekomych evropeyskoy tshasti SSSR*, vol. 5, pt 1, pp. 193–680, Leningrad.

MEYRICK, E. 1895. *A handbook of British Lepidoptera*, vi + 844 pp. London.

OBRAZTSOV, N. S. 1959. Die Gattungen der palaearktischen Tortricidae, II, die Unterfamilie Olethreutinae (2), *Tijdschr. Entomol.*, vol. 102, pt 2, pp. 175–216.

R.L., 1817. (Review of) die Schmetterlinge von Europa von Ferdinand Ochsenheimer, vierter Band, 1816. *Jenaische allg. Literatur-Ztg*, vol. 14, fasc. 36, cols 281–288.

RAZOWSKI, J. 1976. Phylogeny and system of Tortricidae. *Acta zool. Cracov.*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 73–120.

—— 1977. Catalogue of the generic names used in Tortricidae (Lepidoptera). *Acta zool. Cracov.*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 207–295.

TREITSCHKE, F. 1829. *Die Schmetterlinge von Europa*, Fortsetzung vol. 7, p. 321.

VAN DEURS, W. 1956. Sommerflugle VIII, Viklere, in *Danmarks Fauna*, vol. 61, 292 pp. 31 pls.

WALSINGHAM, M. A. 1897. Revision of the West Indian Microlepidoptera with descriptions of the new species. *Proc. zool. Soc. London*, pp. 54–183.
—— 1914. Fam. II Olethreutidae, in Godman & Salvin, *Biologia Centr.-Amer.*, Zool., Lepidoptera Heterocera, vol. 4, pp. 224–266.

BYRRHUS MURINUS FABRICIUS, 1794 (COLEOPTERA, BYRRHIDAE): PROPOSED CONSERVATION BY THE SUPPRESSION OF *BYRRHUS UNDULATUS* AND *BYRRHUS RUBIDUS* KUGELANN, 1792. Z.N.(S.)2314

By M. Mroczkowski (*Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland*)

J. G. Kugelann (1792, p. 484) described *Byrrhus undulatus* from Osterode (now Ostróda, Poland) and *Byrrhus rubidus* from Königsberg (now Kaliningrad, USSR). Since their establishment, *B. rubidus* has been used only once (Panzer, 1797, p. 14) and *B. undulatus* only four times (Panzer, 1794, p. 34; 1797, p. 14; Illiger, 1798, p. 94; Duftschmid, 1825, p. 16). Schönherr, (1806, p. 112) synonymised both Kugelann's species with *Byrrhus murinus* Fabricius, 1794, p. 437 and this has been accepted ever since (except by Duftschmid, loc. cit.). All Kugelann's material was destroyed in the Second World War.

2. The specific name *murinus* has been used by all 19th and 20th century authors. In some works, chiefly monographs and catalogues (e.g. Dalla Torre, 1911) Kugelann's names are given as synonyms of it. The nominal species *Byrrhus murinus* Fabricius, 1794 is the type species, by subsequent designation herein, of *Porcinolus* Mulsant & Rey, 1869. *Porcinolus murinus* is a very common species in the whole of Europe and Asia.

3. The following references satisfy the criteria of Article 79b for the conservation of *Byrrhus murinus*:

Burakowski, B., Mroczkowski, M. & Stefańska, J. 1983. *Cat. faunae Poloniae,* part 23, vol. 9, p. 194

Fiori, G. 1956. *Mem. Mus. civ. St. nat. Verona,* vol. 5, p. 281

Haber, A. 1957. *Roczn. Nauk Leśn.,* vol. 20, p. 79

Horion, A. 1955. *Entomol. Arb. Mus. Frey* (Tutzing bei München), Sonderband, p. 242

Karczewski, J. 1961. *Fol. For. Polonica,* A, Warszawa, vol. 6, p. 62

Kloet, G. S. & Hincks, W. D. 1977. *Check-list Brit. Ins.,* 2nd edit., Part 3 revised by R. D. Pope, p. 47

Mroczkowski, M. 1958. In *Klucze do oznaczania owadów Polski,* vol. 19, pts 50–51, p. 22

Paulus, H. F. 1970. *Ann. Hist.-nat. Mus. nat. Hung.,* vol. 62, p. 250

—— 1979. Byrrhidae in *Die Käfer Mitteleuropas,* vol. 6, p. 345

Silfverberg, H., ed. 1979. *Enum. Coleopt. Fennoscand. et Daniae,* p. 38.

4. In the light of the above evidence the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the following specific names for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy:

(a) *undulatus* Kugelann, 1792, as published in the binomen *Byrrhus undulatus*;

(b) *rubidus* Kugelann, 1792, as published in the binomen *Byrrhus rubidus*;

(2) to place the generic name *Porcinolus* Mulsant & Rey, 1869 (gender: masculine), type species, by subsequent designation herein, *Byrrhus murinus* Fabricius, 1794, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *murinus* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Byrrhus murinus* (specific name of type species of *Porcinolus* Mulsant & Rey, 1869) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the two specific names *undulatus* Kugelann, 1792, as published in the binomen *Byrrhus undulatus,* and *rubidus* Kugelann, 1792, as published in the binomen *Byrrhus rubidus,* both as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

DALLA TORRE, K. W. VON 1911. *Coleopterorum Catalogus,* pt 33, 96 pp. Berlin.

DUFTSCHMID, C. 1825. *Fauna Austriae, oder Beschreibung der österreichischen Insecten,* etc. pt 3, 289 pp. Linz.

FABRICIUS, J. C. 1794. *Entomol. syst.,* emendata et aucta, vol. 4, viii+478 pp. Hafniae.

ILLIGER, K. 1798. *Verzeichniss der Käfer Preussens,* xlii+310 pp. Halle.

KUGELANN, J. G. 1792. *Neuestes Mag. Liebhaber Entomol.* vol. 1, Heft 2–4, pp. 252–306, 477–512.

MULSANT, E. & REY, C. 1869. *Hist. nat. coléopt, France,* pt 22, Piluliformes, 176 pp., 2 pl. Paris (See also *Ann. Soc. linn. Lyon,* n.s. vol. 17, pp. 201–382, 2 pls.

PANZER, G. W. F. 1794. *Deutschlands Insectenfauna oder entomol. Taschenb. für das Jahr 1795,* 36+372 pp., 13 pl. Nürnberg.

—— 1797. *Faunae Insectorum Germaniae initia, oder Deutschlands Insecten,* Jahrgang 4, Heft 37, 24 sheets, 24 pls. Nürnberg.

SCHOENHERR, C. J. 1806. *Synonymia Insectorum,* vol. 1, pt 1, xxii+294 pp. Stockholm.

RHOPALOCERUS W. REDTENBACHER, 1842 (COLEOPTERA, COLYDIDAE): PROPOSED CONSERVATION BY THE SUPPRESSION OF *SPARTYCERUS* MOTSCHULSKY, 1837. Z.N.(S.)2456

By M. Mroczkowski (*Zoological Institute, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland*)

In 1837, p. 100, Motschulsky described a new genus *Spartycerus* for *Monotoma? rondanii* A. Villa & J. B. Villa, 1833, p. 36 (type species, by monotypy).

2. In 1838, p. 208, Erichson emended Motschulsky's name to *Spartecerus*. This was not only an unjustified emendation but also a junior homonym of *Spartecerus* Schönherr, 1834 (Coleoptera, CURCULIONIDAE). Motschulsky, however, (1840, p. 186) accepted Erichson's emendation as justified and replaced *Spartycerus* (and the junior homonym *Spartecerus*) by the new name *Apeistus*.

3. In 1842, p. 21, W. Redtenbacher described a new genus *Rhopalocerus* with only one new species, *Rhopalocerus setosus* (type species, by monotypy). In 1845, L. Redtenbacher synonymised his brother's name *Rhopalocerus* with *Spartycerus* Motschulsky. This is the last known use of *Spartycerus* as a valid name.

4. In 1846 Agassiz emended Motschulsky's *Apeistus* to *Apistus*. This is not only an unjustified emendation but a junior homonym of *Apistus* Cuvier in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1829 (Pisces).

5. In 1849, p. 183, L. Redtenbacher synonymised *Monotoma? rondanii* A. Villa & J. B. Villa, 1833 with *Rhopalocerus setosus* W. Redtenbacher, 1842, and used the combination *Apeistus rondanii* as valid. The name *Apeistus* (or *Apistus*) was in continuous use for the genus in question up to 1911, when Reitter (p. 108) found that *Apistus* was preoccupied. He adopted the name *Rhopalocerus* and after his work, and that of Hetschko, 1930, many coleopterologists used *Rhopalocerus* as a valid name. That name is now well known and in continuous use as the valid name for the genus in question.

6. In 1899 Ganglbauer established a new tribe APISTINI based on *Apistus* Agassiz (non Cuvier). After Ganglbauer, 1899, the tribe name APISTINI was used only once, by Schaufuss, 1916. In 1911 Reitter, p. 108, established the new tribe RHOPALOCERINI based on *Rhopalocerus* W. Redtenbacher. Hetschko, 1930, listed five genera in this tribe, for which the name RHOPALOCERINI is in continuous use. The following are examples of the use of these two names in recent years:
1959. Nicolas, J.–P. & J.–L. *Bull. mens. Soc. linn. Lyon*, vol. 28, p. 158

1961. Horion, A. *Faunistik der mitteleuropäischen Käfer,* vol. 8, Clavicornia, Part 2, p. 75. Überlingen–Bodensee.
1964. Siroki, Z. *Folia entomol. Hungarica* n.s. vol. 17, p. 175
1967. Vogt, H. Colydiidae in *Die Käfer Mitteleuropas,* vol. 7, p. 202. Krefeld.
1969. Viana, M. J. *Neotropica,* vol. 15, pt 47, p. 99
1977. Dajoz, R. *Faune de l'Europe et du bassin Méditerranéen,* vol. 8, p. 153. Paris
1982. Burakowski, B. *Las Bielański w Warszawie rezerwat przyrody,* p. 180. Warsaw
1982. Lucht, W. *Entomol. Blätter,* vol. 78, p. 32.

7. According to the provisions of the Code, *Spartycerus* Motschulsky, 1837 is the valid name for this genus, but the last use of that name as a valid name was in 1845. I believe that the interests of stability would best be served by conserving the name *Rhopalocerus* W. Redtenbacher, 1842, but the suppression of *Spartycerus* to achieve that end would immediately make its junior objective synonym, *Apeistus* Motschulsky, 1840 the valid name for the genus. The only uses of that name are as follows:

Redtenbacher, L. *Fauna austriaca,* edit. 1, 1849, p. 21; edit. 2, 1858, p. lxxxi; edit. 3, 1874, p. lxxxviii
Lacordaire, *Genera des Coléoptères,* 1854, vol. 2, p. 380
Jacquelin du Val, *Genera des Coléoptères d'Europe,* 1859, vol. 2 (4), p. 180
Seidlitz, *Fauna baltica,* edit. 1, 1872, p. 40 (Gatt.); edit. 2, Lief. 3, 1888, p. 59 (Gatt.)
—— *Fauna transsylvanica,* Lief. 3–4, 1889, p. 59 (Gatt.),

Apeistus was then replaced by *Apistus* until 1911, when, as we have seen, the status of that name as a junior homonym was recognised. *Apeistus* must, however, also be suppressed to gain the desired stability of *Rhopalocerus.*

8. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic names *Spartycerus* Motschulsky, 1837 and *Apeistus* Motschulsky, 1840, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;
(2) to place the generic name *Rhopalocerus* W. Redtenbacher, 1842 (gender: masculine), type species, by monotypy, *Rhopalocerus setosus* W. Redtenbacher, 1842, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;
(3) to place the specific name *rondanii* A. Villa & J. B. Villa, 1833, as published in the binomen *Monotoma? rondanii* (at present the valid name for the type species of *Rhopalocerus* W. Redtenbacher, 1842) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the family-group name RHOPALOCERINI Reitter, 1911 (type genus, *Rhopalocerus* W. Redtenbacher, 1842) on the Official List of Family–Group Names in Zoology;
(5) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology:
  (a) *Spartycerus* Motschulsky, 1837, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above;
  (b) *Apeistus* Motschulsky, 1840, a junior objective synonym of *Spartycerus* Motschulsky, 1837, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above;
(6) to place the family-group name APISTINI Ganglbauer, 1899 (invalid because based on a junior homonym) on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

AGASSIZ, L. 1846. *Nomenclatoris zoologici index universalis,* viii+393 pp. Soloduri.

CUVIER, G. & VALENCIENNES, A. 1829. *Histoire naturelle des poissons,* vol. 4, xxvii+518 pp., pls 72–99. Paris.

ERICHSON, W. F. 1838. Bericht über die Leistungen in der Entomologie während des Jahres 1837. *Archiv. für Naturges.,* Jahrg. 4, vol. 2, pp. 187–264.

GANGLBAUER, L. 1899. *Die Käfer von Mitteleuropa,* vol. 3, iii+1046 pp, 76 figs. Wien.

HETSCHKO, A. 1930. Colydiidae in *Coleopt. Cat.,* vol. 15, fasc. 107, 124 pp. Berlin.

MOTSCHULSKY, V. 1837. Extrait d'une lettre adressée par M. V. Motschulsky à M. B. Zoubkoff. *Bull. Soc. imp. Nat. Moscou,* for 1837, fasc. 5, pp. 97–124, pl. 7.

——— 1840. Enumération systématique des insectes décrits et figurés par T. Victor dans les Mémoires et le Bulletin de la Société impériale de Moscou depuis 1836 jusqu'en 1840. *Bull. Soc. imp. Nat. Moscou,* for 1840, pp. 181–203, pl. 4.

REDTENBACHER, L. 1845. *Die Gattungen der deutschen Käfer-Fauna,* [12]+178 pp., 2 pls.

——— 1849. *Fauna Austriaca,* xxvii+883 pp. Wien.

REDTENBACHER, W. 1842. *Quaedam genera et species coleopterorum Archiducatus Austriae nondum descriptorum.* 31 pp. Vindobonae.

REITTER, E. 1911. *Fauna Germanica. Die Käfer des deustchen Reiches,* vol. 3, 436 pp., 147 figs, pls 81–128. Stuttgart.

SCHAUFUSS, C. 1916. *Calwer's Käferbuch. Einführung in die Kenntnis der Käfer Europas,* 6th ed., vol. 1, 709 pp., 250 figs, 3+20 pls. Stuttgart.

SCHÖNHERR, C. J. 1834. *Genera et species Curculionidum, cum synonymia hujus familiae,* vol. 2, fasc. 2, 669 pp. Parisiis et Lipsiae.

VILLA, A. & VILLA, J. B. 1833. Coleopterorum species novae in catalogo dupletorum extantes, in *Coleoptera Europae dupleta.* pp. 32–36. Mediolani.

CAPYS HEWITSON (1865), (LEPIDOPTERA, LYCAENIDAE), PROPOSED CONSERVATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS: A RESTATEMENT OF THE CASE. Z.N.(S.)1748

By Adrian Penrose (*Assistant Zoologist, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, c/o British Museum (Natural History) London, England*)

In October 1966 (*Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 23, pp. 165–166) an application to the Commission was published by the late N. D. Riley, '*Scoptes* Hübner 1819 V. *Capys* Hewitson 1864 (LEPIDOPTERA: LYCAENIDAE), a case of a forgotten name'. No comment was received concerning this application, but shortly afterwards, article 23b, the article implicated in the application, was the subject of an investigation by a special committee appointed by the Council of the Commission. No further action was taken by the Commission on Riley's application.

2. In his original application, Riley did not formulate proposals for action by the Commission. In a comment supporting the four outstanding requests affecting butterfly generic names, C. F. Cowan (*Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 30, pp. 133–134) laid before the Commission proposals for concluding the application, and these are now incorporated into the present text.

3. Hübner [1819], in his well known *Verzeichnis bekannter Schmetterlinge* introduced the generic name *Scoptes* (p. 111) for a heterogeneous group of three species which he called *Scoptes alpheus* Cram, 182, E.F.; *S. protumnus Linn. Syst. Pap.* 258; and *S. crotopus* Cram. 390. G.H. In the same work Hübner also placed *protumnus* (under its synonym *petalus* Cram, 243. C.D.) in his new genus *Thestor* (l.c. p. 73) and *crotopus* in his new genus *Euselasia* (l.c. p. 24).

4. In 1864 Hewitson (*Ill. Diurn. Lep.*, vol. 1, p. 59) introduced the generic name *Capys* and included in it one species only, namely *Papilio alpheus* Cramer, which automatically became its type species by monotypy.

5. Five years later Butler (1869, *Cat. Diurn. Lep. Fabricius Brit. Mus.*, p. 176) in a footnote to *Scoptes* Hübner, adds '*Capys* of Hewitson'. Butler in this work refers only one species, namely *Alpheus* Cramer, to *Scoptes* but makes no statement at all as to whether or not he regarded *alpheus* as the type species of *Scoptes*. His action cannot be construed as fixing *alpheus* as the type species of *Scoptes*.

6. Scudder in 1875 (*Proc. American Acad. Arts Sci. Boston*, vol. 10, p. 267) in his *Sketch of the Generic Names of the Butterflies*, recited these facts, but did not select a type species for *Scoptes*, considering, for reasons that no longer hold good, that this was unnecessary.

7. Riley was unable to discover any subsequent action by any author that could possibly be accepted as fixing the type species of *Scoptes,* and could only find two other quotations of the name in the whole of the subsequent literature. The first is by Kirby (1871, *Syn. Cat. Diurn. Lep.,* p. 337) who quotes it as a synonym of *Axiocerses* Hübner (1819, l.c., p. 72); the second by Aurivillius (1898, *Rhop. Aeth.,* p. 335, 337) who treats it as a partial synonym of both *Capys* Hewitson and *Leptomyrina* Butler 1898, to both of which it is considerably senior.

8. The question at issue therefore is to decide which of the three nominal species originally included in *Scoptes* by Hübner should be selected as its type species, bearing in mind the desirability of causing the least possible disturbance to the other generic names involved.

9. If *crotopus* is selected, then *Scoptes* becomes a subjective synonym of *Euselasia,* one of the better known genera of RIODINIDAE, and a first reviser choice becomes necessary as between these two names, since according to Hemming (1937, Hübner, vol. 2, p. 198, 253) both these Hübnerian names were published 'early in 1819'; and in all probability a certain amount of taxonomic research would also be necessary.

10. If *protumnus* is selected, then *Scoptes* becomes an objective synonym of *Thestor,* which has *protumnus* as its type species and is a very well-known Lycaenid generic name, already the subject of considerable misuse. Here again, and for precisely the same reason, a first reviser choice would be necessary.

11. If *alpheus* is selected, then, *Scoptes* becomes an objective senior synonym of *Capys* Hewitson, which also has *alpheus* as its type species and is the current name, and has been for 100 years, for a well known genus of South African Lycaenidae.

12. Whichever of these courses is adopted there will be a risk of disturbance of long accepted practice (first and second choices), or an actual disturbance (third choice). As the consequences of the latter may be avoided by the Commission acting under its plenary powers, the Commission is hereby requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers:
  (a) to set aside all type species designations for the nominal genus *Scoptes* Hübner [1819], and having done so to nominate *Papilio alphaeus* Cramer [1777], (*Uitl. Kapellen,* vol. 2 (16), p. 31, pl. 182, figs. E.F.) as type species of that genus:
  (b) to suppress the generic name *Scoptes* Hübner, [1819], for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;
(2) to place the generic name *Capys* Hewitson (1865) (gender masculine), type species, by monotypy, *Papilio alpheus* Cramer, [1777], on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *alpheus* Cramer, [1777], as published in the binomen *Papilio alpheus* (type species of *Capys* Hewitson (1865)), on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the generic name *Scoptes* Hübner [1819], and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.

A list of ten references to the use of *Capys* Hewitson, 1864 by five different authors within the last fifty years is held at the Commission's office.

HYLA LACTEA DAUDIN, 1803 (AMPHIBIA): REQUEST FOR CONSERVATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.) 2341

By John D. Lynch (*School of Life Sciences, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68588, U.S.A.*) & William E. Duellman (*Museum of Natural History and Department of Systematics and Ecology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045, U.S.A.*)

In 1768 Laurenti (*Synopsin Reptilium* ... p. 34) named *Hyla lactea* and gave a brief diagnosis (=description) based on two specimens, one in the 'museo Academico Upsaliensi' and one in the 'museo Petropolitano'. These type specimens are apparently no longer extant. In 1803 Daudin (*Hist. Nat. des Rainettes* ... p. 29) considered Laurenti's *Hyla lactea* the same as his *Hyla hypocondrialis* (holotype lost, *fide* Duellman, 1977, *Das Tierreich*, vol. 95, p. 161) and for unknown reasons, proposed (p. 30) *Hyla lactea* Daudin as a new species from 'America'. The latter is based on Mus. nat. Hist. Paris no. 4870, an adult female.

2. Laurenti, 1768, also named *Hyla aurantiaca*, based on a figure in Seba (1734, *Thesaurus* ..., vol. 1, pl. 71, figs. 3). *Hyla aurantiaca* Laurenti either has been ignored except as a senior primary homonym of *H. aurantiaca* Daudin (Duellman, 1977, p. 179) or has been viewed as a subjective synonym of *Hyla boans* (Rivero, 1961, *Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool.* vol. 126, p. 137). Linné (1758, *Systema Naturae* ... 10th ed., ... p. 213) cited no type for *Rana boans* but his indications included references to Seba's figure as well as to one of his earlier works (Linné, 1754, *Mus. Adolph. Frider*, ... I, p. 47). A type specimen for Linné's (1754) taxon was found (Lönnberg, 1896, *Bihang Svenska, Vet.-Akad. Handl.*, vol. 22, p. 13; Andersson, 1900, *Bihang Svenska. Vet.-Akad. Handl.*, vol. 26, p. 17; Mertens, 1940, *Zool. Anz.* vol. 132, p. 195) and has been termed the 'holotype' (Mertens, 1972, *Senckenberg. Biol.*, vol. 53, p. 197; Duellman, 1977, p. 39) but is best viewed as the lectotype for *Rana boans* (rendering Rivero's, 1961, p. 137, suggestion that *Hyla aurantiaca* Laurenti and *Rana boans* Linné are objective synonyms moot). Daudin, 1803, proposed his own *Hyla aurantiaca* as a new species based on Mus. nat. Hist. nat. Paris no. 4871, an adult female.

3. Duméril & Bibron (1841, *Erpétologie Générale* ..., vol. 8, p. 612) first proposed that *Hyla aurantiaca* Daudin and *Hyla lactea* Daudin were identical, a view consistently held by systematists interested in neotropical frogs. In 1838, Tschudi (*Classif. Batrachier* ... p. 71) proposed a new genus, *Sphaenorhynchus*, based on *Hyla lactea* Daudin (*Sphaenorhynchus* Tschudi, 1838, is not a junior homonym of *Sphenorynchus* Lichtenstein, 1823, Aves, as alleged by Lutz & Lutz, 1938, *Añais Acad. Bras. Sci.*, vol. 10, p. 178). Most workers in

the last century have recognised the genus although under a variety of names all of which employed Daudin's *Hyla lactea* as the type species.

4. Simple application of the laws of homonymy and priority results in the following:

(1) *Hyla lactea* Laurenti is the oldest name applied to the well-known and widespread tree frog *Phyllomedusa hypocondrialis* (Daudin);

(2) *Hyla aurantiaca* Laurenti is a subjective synonym of the well-known and widespread tree frog *Hyla boans* (Linné, 1758);

(3) neither *Hyla aurantiaca* Daudin nor *Hyla lactea* Daudin is nomenclaturally valid because each is a junior primary homonym. The only nomenclaturally valid name for this widespread Amazonian species is *Sphaenorhynchus eurhostus* Rivero, 1969, a replacement name for *Hyla aurantiaca* Daudin, a junior primary homonym; and

(4) the generic names *Sphaenorhynchus* Tschudi, 1838, *Dryomelictes* Fitzinger, 1843, and *Sphoenohyla* Lutz & Lutz, 1938, are invalid because each is based on a junior primary homonym, *Hyla lactea* Daudin 1803.

5. However, Daudin's (1803, p. 29) association of *Hyla lactea* Laurenti with his *Hyla hypocondrialis* is by no means secure. Duellman & Lynch (1981, *J. Herpetol.* vol. 15, pp. 237–239) showed that the imprecise description could equally apply to *Hyla fasciata* Günther, *H. geographica* Spix, and *Phyllomedusa tomopterna* (Cope), all widespread and well-known Amazonian–Guianan tree frogs. However, salient points in the description of *Hyla lactea* Laurenti are in conflict with the morphologies of each of these four species.

6. Although first listed as a senior name for *Phyllomedusa hypocondrialis* in 1803, *Hyla lactea* Laurenti has been ignored by herpetologists since Daudin, whereas *Hyla lactea* Daudin, 1803 has enjoyed recognition even as the type-species of a genus, in spite of occasional recognition that it is a junior primary homonym (Rivero, 1969, *Copeia* . . . p. 701). We conclude that *Hyla lactea* Laurenti, 1768 is unidentifiable with any species of frog and is therefore a nomen dubium, but as an available name it continues to threaten nomenclatural stability for the genus of cis-Andean hylid frogs called *Sphaenorhynchus.*

7. Accordingly, we now request the Commission:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the specific name *lactea* as used in the combination *Hyla lactea* by Laurenti, 1768, p. 34, for purposes of the Law of Priority and for those of the Law of Homonymy;

(2) to place said specific name on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *lactea* as used in the combination *Hyla lactea* by Daudin, 1803, p. 30, holotype Mus. nat. Hist.

nat. Paris no. 4870; type-locality 'America', on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the generic name *Sphaenorhynchus* Tschudi, 1838, (gender: masculine, type species by monotypy, *Hyla lactea* Daudin, 1803, a primary homonym of *H. lactea* Laurenti, 1768) on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.

COCHLIOMYIA TOWNSEND, 1915 (DIPTERA, CALLIPHORIDAE): PROPOSED CONSERVATION BY THE SUPPRESSION OF *CALLITROGA* BRAUER, 1883. Z.N.(S.)707

By the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

In a recent case concerning the generic name *Somomya* Bertoloni, 1861 (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 40, pp. 106–109) Mr Adrian Pont (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) pointed out that the choice of species to be designated as type species of that nominal genus would make it a senior synonym of one of three other generic names — *Auchmeromyia* Brauer & Bergenstamm, 1891, *Hemilucilia* Brauer, 1895, or *Cochliomyia* Townsend, 1915. He has asked for a designation that will make *Somomya* a senior synonym of *Auchmeromyia* (and for the suppression of the former). While his proposals, if accepted, will remove that threat to the stability of *Cochliomyia,* the latter name is still threatened from a different direction by *Callitroga* Brauer, 1883. As the genus concerned — the screw-worm flies — is important in veterinary medicine, it is necessary for its name to be stabilised.

2. In 1952 Dr Sabrosky addressed a paper to the Commission asking a set of questions designed to clarify the status and the type species of *Callitroga.* His own position in relation to those questions was not stated; in August 1957, therefore, Mr Hemming, then Secretary to the Commission, asked him to frame his questions so as to show a definite position. In reply (October 1957) Dr Sabrosky said that the application could be 'withdrawn or left in abeyance' and that he might take the matter up again when the decisions of the London (1958) Congress on the status of names first published in synonymy had been promulgated. This, however, was not done and it is only the appearance of Mr Pont's application that has caused the case to be reopened.

3. *Callitroga* Brauer, 1883, *Denkschr. Akad. Wiss. Wien, math.–nat. Kl.* vol. 47, p. 74, was proposed in a specific synonymy as '[*Calliphora*] *anthropophaga* Lesbini, Weyenberg et Conil . . . [references] . . . = *Compsomyia* (Rond, 1875) *macellaria* F. conf. *Lucilia hominivorax* Coq. (*Lucilia* O.S., *Callitroga* Schin., *Musca* olim) . . .'. The Paris (1948) Congress (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 4, pp. 350–351) had decided that a generic name first published as the generic component of a binomen in which the specific name is cited in synonymy, is not available. However, *Callitroga* is not clearly published in combination with any particular specific name, so that its status in the light of the Paris decision is obscure. Its subsequent status has varied according to successive decisions of the Commission concerning names first published in synonymy. Usage has fluctuated accordingly and it is now high time that the status of the name was settled once and for all.

4. The Copenhagen (1953) Congress (*Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nom.*, pp. 63–64) decided that names first published in synonymy without an independent indication, definition or description (or, in the case of a generic name, without names of included species associated with it) should not be available unless they had been generally accepted; in that event, such a name would be an objective synonym of the name with which it had originally been synonymised. This proposed provision failed to clarify the status of *Callitroga* because, although clearly synonymised with *Compsomyia,* no specific names were clearly cited in association with it. The London (1958) Congress decided that no name published in synonymy was available (Article 11d of the 1961 edition of the Code).

5. The Washington (1963) Congress modified Article 11d to allow a name first published in synonymy to be available if it had been adopted with its original author and date. *Callitroga* thereby became available as from Brauer, 1883, but usage did not follow this, as will shortly appear.

6. I am indebted to Dr Sabrosky for the following account of the history of usage: 'From Townsend's publication in 1915 (*J. Washington Acad. Sci.* vol. 5, p. 644) of *Cochliomyia* for the New World screwworms until the publication in 1948 of Hall's monograph on The Blowflies of North America (*Thomas Say Found.* No. 4, Purdue Univ., Lafayette, Ind.), *Cochliomyia* alone was used except for a few publications that continued to refer the New World screwworms to the Old World genus *Chrysomya* before *Cochliomyia* came to be widely accepted. This was especially true after Shannon adopted *Cochliomyia* in his synopses of the North American CALLIPHORIDAE (1923, *Insecutor Inscitiae Menstruus,* vol. 11, pp. 101–118; 1925, *Proc. entomol. Soc. Washington,* vol. 28, pp. 115–139). Townsend continued to use *Cochliomyia* in his massive 'Manual of Myiology' (1934–1935, Pts 1, 2; 1937, Pt. 5) (São Paulo); he considered *Callitroga* a synonym of the Old World *Compsomyia* (now a synonym of *Chrysomya*).

7. 'Hall adopted *Callitroga* in his 1948 monograph already mentioned and this usage then prevailed in North America until 1962, after the 1961 Code ruled that names first published in synonymy were not available, but the rest of the world, with few exceptions, continued to use *Cochliomyia.* The North American literature is extensive, of course, because of the importance of screwworms, particularly as pests of cattle and because of the attention devoted to research on control of the pests. The scientific name of the primary screwworm is extensively used in entomological literature, veterinary medicine, cattle growers' journals, state experimental station bulletins, extension service leaflets, etc.

8. 'After the Code was published in November 1961 I promptly notified our Agricultural Research Service of the change to *Cochliomyia,* and the first re-appearance of that name, to the best of my knowledge, appeared in the Cooperative Economic Insect Report (U.S. Dept. Agric.)

sometime in 1962. At the same time I changed usage in my service identifications and manuscript reviews. The way was thus prepared for an abrupt and complete change from *Callitroga* to *Cochliomyia* after D. G. Hall used the latter name in his contribution to Stone and others, 1965, *Catalog of the Diptera of America North of Mexico* (the publication of which had been delayed).

9. 'The Common Name Lists also switched to *Cochliomyia* from 1965 on. These lists are official lists maintained by the Entomological Society of America, with corresponding scientific names. They are used by editors and authors and are constantly scrutinised for accuracy. Obviously they promote and establish a great deal of usage. The first list was published in 1925 (*J. econ. Entomol.* vol. 18, pp. 521–545) and lists have been published ever since at six-year (later five-year) intervals. Generic and specific names for the screwworms have appeared in every list because of the importance of the species. *Cochliomyia* was used in 1925, 1931, 1937 and 1942, *Callitroga* in 1946, 1950, 1955 and 1960, and *Cochliomyia* again from 1965 to the current 1982 list.

10. 'As much of the research on screwworms is done by the staff of the Agricultural Research Service, papers published in *J. econ. Entomol.* quickly reflect the official usage of the service and of the Common Names Lists. From 1940 through 1947 *Cochliomyia* was used in 21 papers by 23 authors and *Callitroga* not at all. In 1948–1950 there were four papers by 10 authors (multiple authorship in team projects is common) using *Callitroga* and none using *Cochliomyia*. This usage prevailed from 1951 through 1961. In 1962, after my change of usage, there were seven papers by 12 authors using *Cochliomyia* and two by five authors using *Callitroga*. From 1963 on only *Cocliomyia* has been used. A similar picture emerges from the *J. med. Entomol.* The *Index of American Economic Entomology*, like the *Review of Applied Entomology*, is less reliable for usage because the editors gather all references under whatever generic name they adopt, with no indication of the name actually used in the work under reference.'

11. The two most cogent arguments for the suppression of *Callitroga* are, first, the now well-established use of *Cochliomyia*, documented above, and, secondly, the confusion over the type species of *Callitroga*. This has been treated differently by different authors. Some have treated the genus as having been established with *anthropophaga*, *macellaria* and *hominivorax* as the originally included species from which a type species could be designated. Hall, 1948, pp. 120, 122 designated *Musca macellaria* Fabricius, 1775, *Syst. Entomol.*, p. 776, as type species on that assumption. *Callitroga* thereby became a senior objective synonym of *Cochliomyia* Townsend, 1915, of which the same species is type species by original designation. Townsend rejected *Callitroga* as invalid and unavailable. Brauer took the view that *macellaria* was the type species by monotypy; he took it as the only originally included species with *anthropophaga* and *hominivorax* as synonyms. Brauer &

Bergenstamm, 1893, p. 179 also apparently took *macellaria* as the type species, although their citations have been ruled out as type-species designations by Opinion 98, 1928. Yet in the same work, p. 194, note 85, they treated *Callitroga* as a synonym of *Compsomyia*; they treated '*anthropophaga* Lesbini' (?non Blanchard, 1872, *C.r. Acad. Sci. Paris,* vol. 75, pp. 1133–1134) as type species and as congeneric with the type species of *Compsomyia* Rondani, 1875, *Ann. Mus. civ. Stor. nat. Genova,* vol. 7, p. 425, namely *Musca dux* Eschscholtz, 1822, *Entomographica,* vol. 1 (1), p. 114, by later designation by Coquillett, 1910, *Proc. U.S. nat. Mus.* no. 1719, p. 526. As the suppression of the generic name is here advocated, the question of the type species of the genus becomes academic.

12. In view of the above evidence, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is hereby asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Callitroga* Brauer, 1883, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;

(2) to place the generic name *Cochliomyia* Townsend, 1915 (gender: feminine), type species, by original designation, *Musca macellaria* Fabricius, 1775, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *macellaria* Fabricius, 1775, as published in the binomen *Musca macellaria* (specific name of type species of *Cochliomyia* Townsend, 1915) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the generic name *Callitroga* Brauer, 1883, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature wishes to express its appreciation of the facilities provided by the Trustees of the British Museum (Natural History) for the Secretariat of the Commission.

CONTENTS

	Page
Officers and Members of the Commission	iii
Members of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature	iv
Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology	67
Special Announcements	69

Comments

On the proposals concerning *Astacilla* Cordiner, 1793. L. B. Holthuis	72
On the proposed conservation of *Crinodes* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855 and *Pero* Herrich-Schäffer, 1855. J. D. Holloway	72

New and revived cases

Zygaena anthyllidis Boisduval, [1828] (Insecta, Lepidoptera). C. M. Naumann & W. G. Tremewan	73
Reptomultisparsa d'Orbigny, 1853 (Bryozoa, Cyclostomata). P. D. Taylor	77
GOERIDAE Ulmer, 1903 versus TRICHOSTOMATIDAE Rambur, 1842 (Insecta, Trichoptera). The Secretary	80
Atractocera latipes Meigen, 1804 (Insecta, Diptera, Simuliidae). I. A. Rubtsov, with comment by R. W. Crosskey	83
Choeropsis Leidy, 1852 (Artiodactyla). R. M. Schoch & S. G. Lucas	94
Centrurus limpidus Karsch, 1879 and *Centruroides ornatus* Pocock, 1902 (Arachnia, Scorpiones). O. F. Francke	97
Leucaspis Signoret, 1869 (Insecta, Homoptera, Diaspididae). E. M. Danzig & I. M. Kerzhner	101
Tomiopsis Benediktova, 1956 (Spiriferida, Brachiopoda). N. W. Archbold & G. A. Thomas	105
CAECILIIDAE in Amphibia and Insecta (Psocoptera). H. M. Smith & J. T. Polhemus	108
Laspeyresia Hübner. [1825] (Insecta, Lepidoptera). V. I. Kuznetsove & I. M. Kerzhner	110
Byrrhus murinus Fabricius, 1794 (Coleoptera, Byrrhidae). M. Mroczkowski	114
Rhopalocerus W. Redtenbacher, 1842 (Coleoptera, Colydidae) M. Mroczkowski	116
Capys Hewitson (1865) (Lepidoptera, Lyicaenidae). A. Penrose	119
Hyla lactea Daudin, 1803 (Amphibia). J. D. Lynch & W. E. Duellman	122
Cochliomyia Townsend, 1915 (Diptera, Calliphoridae). The Secretary	125

Printed in Great Britain by Henry Ling Ltd., at the Dorset Press, Dorchester, Dorset

25 2702

23 August 1984 Volume 41 Part 3
pp. v–vi, 129–190
ISSN 0007-5167

The Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature

The Official Organ of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature





COMMONWEALTH AGRICULTURAL BUREAUX

The Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature

Published by: **Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux**

On behalf of: **International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature**
c/o British Museum (Natural History)
Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.

Orders and enquiries concerning subscriptions and back numbers should be sent to:

CENTRAL SALES
COMMONWEALTH AGRICULTURAL BUREAUX
FARNHAM ROYAL
SLOUGH SL2 3BN, U.K.

© *International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature 1984.* All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronically, mechanically, by photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

President: Dr. W.D.L. RIDE *(School of Applied Science, Canberra College of Advanced Education, P.O. Box 1, Belconnen, A.C.T. 2616, Australia).*

Vice-President: Prof. Per BRINCK *(Ecology Building, University of Lund, S-223 62, Lund, Sweden).*

Secretary: Mr. R.V. MELVILLE *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD).*

B. The Members of the Commission

(Arranged in order of election or of most recent re-election)

Prof. Per BRINCK *(Ecology Building, University of Lund, S-223 62, Lund, Sweden)* (30 September 1972) *(Vice-President)* **Arthropoda; Ecology**

Prof. Dr. Raphael ALVARADO *(Departamento de Zoologia, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Madrid, Madrid 3, Spain)* (30 September 1972) **Echinoidea; Asteroidea**

Prof. E. BINDER *(Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle, CH 1211 Geneva 6, Switzerland)* (30 September 1972) **Mollusca**

Dr. L.B. HOLTHUIS *(Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands)* (30 September 1972) *(Councillor)* **Crustacea**

Dr. G. BERNARDI *(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005, Paris, France)* (30 September 1972) *(Councillor)* **Lepidoptera**

Prof. C. DUPUIS *(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005, Paris, France)* (30 September 1972) **Heteroptera**

Dr. M. MROCZKOWSKI *(Instytut Zoologiczny, Polska Akademia Nauk. ul. Wilcza 64, Warsaw, Poland)* (14 March 1975) **Coleoptera**

Prof. Dr. Otto KRAUS *(Zoologisches Institut und Zoologisches Museum, 2000 Hamburg 13, Germany)* (29 September 1976) **Arachnida, Myriapoda**

Dr. W.D.L. RIDE *(School of Applied Science, Canberra College of Advanced Education, P.O. Box 1, Belconnen, A.C.T. 2616, Australia)* (29 September 1976) *(President):* **Mammalia: Recent and Fossil**

Dr. Curtis W. SABROSKY *(Systematic Entomology Lab., USDA c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.)* (29 September 1976) *(Councillor)* **Diptera**

Dr. H.G. COGGER *(Australian Museum, Sydney 2000, N.S.W. Australia)* (29 September 1976) **Reptilia; E D P Methods**

Prof. Dr. Gerhard HAHN *(Fachbereich Geowissenschaften, Universitätsgebiet Lahnberge, 3550 Marburg, BRD)* (27 December 1978) **Palaeontology**

Prof. Dr. O. HALVORSEN *(Institute of Biology and Geology, University of Tromsö, P.O. Box 790, N-9001 Tromsö, Norway)* (27 December 1978) **Parasitology**

Dr. V.A. TRJAPITZIN, *(Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad B-164, USSR)* (27 December 1978) **Entomology**

Dr. F.M. BAYER *(U.S. National Museum of Natural History, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.)* (23 August 1979) *(Councillor)* **Octocorallia; Systematics**

Prof. John O. CORLISS *(University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, U.S.A.)* (23 August 1979) **Protozoa; Systematics**

Mr. R.V. MELVILLE *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD)* (23 August 1979) *(Secretary)* **Palaeontology**

Dr. Y.I. STAROBOGATOV *(Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad 199164, U.S.S.R.)* (23 August 1979) **Mollusca, Crustacea**

Dr. P.T. LEHTINEN, *(Zoological Museum, Department of Biology, University of Turku. SF-20500 Turku 50, Finland)* (8 August 1980) **Arachnida**

Dr. L.R.M. COCKS *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London, SW7 5BD)* (26 August 1982) **Brachiopoda**

Mr. David HEPPELL *(Department of Natural History, Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh EH1 1JF, Scotland)* (26 August 1982) *(Councillor)* **Mollusca**

Prof. Jay M. SAVAGE *(Department of Biology, University of Miami, P.O. Box 249118, Coral Gables, Florida 33124, U.S.A.)* (26 August 1982) **Herpetology**

Prof. R. SCHUSTER *(Institut für Zoologie, Universität Graz, Universitätsplatz 2, A–8010 Graz, Austria)* (26 August 1982) **Acari**

Dr. SHUN-ICHI UENO *(Department of Zoology, National Science Museum, Hyakunincho 3-23-1, Shinjukuku, Tokyo 160, Japan)* (26 August 1982) **Entomology**

Prof. A. WILLINK *(Universidad Nacional de Tucumán, Instituto Miguel Lillo, Miguel Lillo 205, 4000 Tucumán, Argentina)* (26 August 1982) **Neotropical Hymenoptera**

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Members of the Trust

Professor H.B. Whittington, F.R.S. *(Chairman)*
Dr. F.G.W. Jones *(Secretary and Managing Director)*
Prof. Per Brinck
Prof. J.H. Callomon, F.R.S.C.
Prof. C.B. Cox, F.G.S.
Prof. D. Curry, F.G.S.
The Rt. Hon. the Earl of Cranbrook, F.L.S., F.Z.S.
Sir Arthur Drew, K.C.B.
Sir Charles Fleming, K.B.E., F.R.S.
Prof. J. Forest
Col. Francis J. Griffin, O.B.E.
Dr. G.C. Gruchy
Dr. R.H. Hedley, F.I.Biol.
Dr. L.B. Holthuis
Sir Peter Kent, F.R.S.
Prof. Dr. O. Kraus
Dr. M. Luc
Dr. I.W.B. Nye
Dr. E.P.F. Rose, T.D.
Dr. W.D.L. Ride *(ex officio)*
Sir Eric Smith, F.R.S.
Dr. G.B. White
Prof. J.M. Dodd, F.R.S. *(Observer for the Royal Society)*

B. The Officers of the Trust

Mr. R.V. Melville, M.Sc. *(Scientific Controller)*
Mr. M.E. Tollitt, M.Sc., F.L.S., F.R.E.S. *(Assistant Zoologist)*
Mr. J.D.D. Smith, F.G.S. *(Administrator)*

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 41, part 3 (pp. v–vi, 129–190) 23 August 1984

NOTICES

(a) *Date of commencement of voting.* In normal circumstances the Commission may start to vote on applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* six months after the publication of each application. Any zoologist who wishes to comment on any of the applications in the present part is invited to send his contribution, in duplicate, to the Secretariat of the Commission as quickly as possible, and in any case in time to reach the Secretariat before the close of the six-month period.

(b) *Possible use of the plenary powers.* The possible use by the Commission of its plenary powers is involved in the following applications published in the present part of the *Bulletin* (any marked with an asterisk involve the application of Articles 23a–b and 79b):

(1) Explication du vote sur le projet de la troisième édition du Code Internationale de Nomenclature Zoologique. Z.N.(G.) 197. C. Dupuis.

(2) International Code of Zoological Nomenclature: amendment proposed to third edition: Proposal concerning Article 51c. Z.N.(S.) 2474. R.J. Gagné & F.C.Thompson, and L.V. Knutson.

(3) International Code of Zoological Nomenclature: proposed amendment to third edition: Article 59b. Z.N.(S.)2475. Z. Boucek.

(4) Request for a declaration clarifying the meaning of the expressions 'Suppressed for nomenclatural purposes', 'Rejected for nomenclatural purposes' and the status of information in works that are rejected under Articles 8 and 9 of the Code. Z.N.(S.) 2476. L.B. Holthuis, W.D.L. Ride and C.W. Sabrosky.

(5) A proposed amendment to Article 70b of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature on misidentified type species. Z.N.(S.) 2477. C.W. Sabrosky.

*(6) *Williamia* Monterosato, 1884 (Mollusca, Gastropoda): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.)2237. H.B. Rehder.

(7) *Tibicina* Amyot, 1847 and *Lyristes* Horváth, 1926 (Insecta, Hemiptera, Homoptera): proposed conservation by the suppression of *Tibicen* Berthold, 1827. Z.N.(S.) 239. R.V. Melville & R.W. Sims; also, Arguments pour la suppression du nom de genre *Tibicen* et de ses dérivés dans la

nomenclature de la superfamille CICADOIDEA. M. Boulard.

(8) *Rana maculata* Brocchi, 1877 and *Eleutherodactylus richmondi* Stejneger, 1904 (Amphibia, Salientia): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.)1750. The Secretary.

(9) *Hypocryphalus mangiferae* (Stebbing, 1914) (Insecta, Coleoptera): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2142. S. Wood.

(c) *Receipt of new applications.* The following new applications have been received since the publication of vol. 41(2) on 29 June 1984 (any marked with an asterisk involve the application of Articles 23a–b and 79b):

(1) *Chelifer* Geoffroy, 1762 (Arachnida, Pseudoscorpionida, Cheliferidae): proposed validation. Z.N.(S.)2478. M.S. Harvey.

(2) *Ammonites perarmatus* J. Sowerby, 1822 (Cephalopoda, Ammonoidea): proposed exemption from law of homonymy. Z.N.(S.) 2479. M.K. Howarth.

(3) *Erigone* Savigny & Audouin, 1825 (Arachnida, Araneae): proposed designation of type species. Z.N.(S.)2480. A.F. Millidge.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS FOR NEW MEMBERS

This notice is issued under Article 4 of the Constitution of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and announces the names, nationalities and fields of specialisation of members of the Commission whose terms of service have terminated or will terminate at the close of the next meeting (in 1985) of the General Assembly of the International Union of Biological Sciences.

No members of the Commission will be due to retire because they have served for the full period of their appointment, but there will be four vacancies to be filled to maintain the Commission at its present size. These vacancies arise as follows:

Brinck, Professor P. (Sweden, Ecology, Arthropoda) wishes to resign.

Melville, Mr R.V. (United Kingdom, Palaeontology) wishes to resign.

Sabrosky, Dr C.W. (United States of America, Diptera) reaches the age limit.

Welch, Professor H.E. (Canada, Nematoda) has retired on the grounds of ill health.

Article 2b of the Constitution states: 'The members of the Commission shall be eminent scientists, irrespective of nationality, with a distinguished record in any branch of zoology, who are known to have an interest in zoological nomenclature'. Nominations are now invited for successors having these qualifications to be elected to the places vacated.

Retiring members may themselves be nominated, but Professor Brinck and Mr Melville have intimated that they do not wish their names to be put forward.

The Commission wishes to receive more nominations than there are vacancies so as to be able to make a genuine choice between candidates and maintain a balanced geographical and disciplinary representation. Nominations should be sent, if possible by the end of December, 1984, to: The Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, England.

INTERNATIONAL CODE OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Following the announcement in vol. 41, part 2 of the forthcoming appearance of the Third Edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, we can now announce that arrangements have been made for publication to be undertaken by the British Museum (Natural History), London. The book will make up into about 320 pages of format 216×318 mm. The price will be £15 plus £1.50 postage and packing.

There is a pre-publication offer price of £13.50 plus £1.50 postage and packing on orders accompanied by remittance received before 31 January 1985. Orders should be sent to Publications Sales, British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.

R.V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
August 1984

COMMENTS ON THE TYPE SPECIES OF *ANOLIS* DAUDIN, 1802 Z.N.(S.) 1603

(see vol. 20, pp. 438–439; vol. 40, pp. 15–19)

(1) By Ernest E. Williams (*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, U.S.A.*) and Hobart M. Smith (*Department E.P.O. Biology, University of Colorado 334, Boulder, Colorado, 80309, U.S.A.*)

Responding to the comment on this case by Sabrosky and to the alternative proposal by Stimson and Underwood, we have reconsidered quite objectively all the data and arguments available to us and conclude that the requests of the original petition are overwhelmingly justified despite the existence therein of the several factual and interpretative errors or glossed over ambiguities pointed out by Sabrosky (loc. cit.).

We are grateful for Sabrosky's discussion of the type designation of *bullaris* by Stejneger, 1904, and its reiteration by Stejneger & Barbour in several checklists. We would emend Sabrosky's statements to assert that Stejneger did not intend to fix *Lacerta bullaris* Linnaeus 1758 as the type of *Anolis* but instead chose *bullaris* Daudin, 1802. We interpret the odd hyphenated notation in the checklists as an attempt to clarify Stejneger's 1904 type designation—an attempt made necessary by the transparently composite nature of Daudin's concept of *bullaris*.

Stejneger, 1904, did not explicitly cite *Lacerta bullaris* Linnaeus, 1758. His designation of a type is a parenthetical mention after citation of Daudin as the author of the genus *Anolis*. We treat as clear indication of Stejneger's intention his acquiescence, noticed by Sabrosky, in a notation that treated *bullaris* (italicised) as an invalid name equivalent to and replaced by *carolinensis*, a name proposed by Voigt many years later. It has always seemed an anomaly that so able and fastidious a nomenclaturist as Stejneger would suppress (without comment or documentation) a Linnean name. It is clear to us that he did not do so, that instead he recognised that *bullaris* Daudin was not the equivalent of *Lacerta bullaris* Linnaeus.

Daudin's concept of *bullaris* was, as Stejneger, Barbour and Boulenger supposed, very different from Linnaeus's concept of *Lacerta bullaris*. It appears to have escaped notice that Daudin (*Histoire Naturelle ... des Reptiles*, vol. 4, p. 69, 1803) gave a Latin description of his *Anolis bullaris*: 'Viridescens aut sub-rufus, macula temporali nigra cauda cylindrica, non cristata'. Apart from the green colour this cannot apply to either of the two Jamaican species which may have been the source of Catesby's plate 66, *'Lacerta viridis jamaicensis'*, upon which Linnaeus explicitly and without ambiguity based his concept of *Lacerta bullaris*. In both Jamaican species the tail is compressed, not cylindrical, and this character was especially cited by Daudin as a distinction between two groups within *Anolis* typified by his *Anolis bimaculatus* and his *A. bullaris*.

Any reading of Daudin's description of *A. bullaris* makes it quite clear that his concept was confused and composite. His first citation under his description is not Linnaeus, but 'Le roquet' of Lacepède, now believed to apply to a species from Martinique. He cites also *Lacerta cinereus minor* of Sloan, presumably a Jamaican species but not applicable to either *A. garmani* or *A.*

grahami, before citing Linnaeus. His French appellation for his species is 'L'Anolis roquet ou rouge-gorge'. The last is explicit reference to a red or reddish dewlap found in *A. carolinensis*, not found in any Jamaican species nor in the one species that exists in Martinique.

The one specimen cited and the measurements given by Daudin were from the Bosc collection for which again (p. 75) the character 'une queue mince, cylindrique' is given. Daudin (p. 76) indicates that Bosc collected 'en Caroline' but apparently (p. 71) received specimens also from 'San-Domingue'. There is evident confusion of lizards from several localities and of species now understood to be very distant in relationship.

The one name cited in synonymy by Daudin which is of unambiguous and unmistakable application is *'Lacerta viridis carolinensis'* of Catesby's plate 65. By virtue of the locality this name, if chosen, as Stejneger wished, as the type of *Anolis* can cause no future complications.

We note that acceptance of *A. carolinensis* as the equivalent of *Anolis bullaris* Daudin in at least part greatly antedates Stejneger & Barbour's formal citations and even Stejneger's action. Duméril & Bibron (1837, p. 131), Fitzinger (1843, p. 68) and Boulenger (1885, p. 43) all cite Daudin's species in the synonymy of *carolinensis*. We submit that Stejneger had no intention except to formalise a consensus — at that time well understood. No other interpretation makes sense of Stejneger & Barbour's treatment of *bullaris* as an invalid name and *carolinensis* as a valid one — although this has been the usage, informed or not, of the herpetological community for 150 years.

On the grounds stated above we regard the identity of *Lacerta bullaris* Linnaeus as irrelevant to the problem of the type species of *Anolis* Daudin. We do so under Art. 70b of the Code, pertaining to deliberate misuse of identification. Art. 70 states that 'It is to be assumed that an author correctly identifies the nominal species that he ... includes in a new nominal genus ... when he establishes it....'. In the present context, 'correct identification' means utilisation of a name (*bullaris*) in the sense of the original author (Linnaeus), hence basically on the same grounds; 'misidentification' similarly means utilisation of that name (*bullaris*) in a basically different sense (as Daudin did).

Art. 49 also makes it clear that, under the Code, subsequent usages of any species group name, whatever the context, whether the original or different, have no bearing upon the proper application of that name, which remains fixed by its original proposal, with one exception: designation of type species of a new genus. As clarified by Art. 70b, 'If the type designated for a new nominal genus is a previously established species but the designator states that he employs its specific name in accordance with the wrong usage of a previous author, the type species is to be interpreted as the one actually before the designator, not the one that correctly bears the name'. This article fits perfectly the circumstances of Stejneger's selection of *A. bullaris* Daudin as type for *Anolis*, interpreted as what was later called *Anolis carolinensis* by Voigt in 1832, but which was represented in Daudin's concept of *bullaris* as indicated by his citation of Catesby's pre-Linnean (1743) *Lacerta viridis carolinensis*, pl. 65. That no properly available name for the Catesby species existed when Daudin wrote is immaterial since Art. 70b goes on to permit the chosen name in the new genus to be treated as a new name, credited to the designator as of his date. Since Stejneger in 1904 selected another name which had already been proposed (*Anolis carolinensis* Voigt, 1832) to substitute for the particular part of *Anolis*

bullaris of Daudin he chose as type for the genus, it seems to us that he conformed with at least the spirit of the Code, if not its exact wording, and that we can be spared an *Anolis bullaris* Stejneger, 1904 (= *Anolis carolinensis* Voigt, 1832) as the type species of *Anolis* (the nominal type species of a genus does not have to have a valid name, as stated in Art. 69a (i)).

The end result of either route, however, is the same: *Anolis carolinensis* Voigt is the type species of *Anolis* Daudin through application of Art. 70, whether it is construed that an *Anolis bullaris* Stejneger, 1904, was created in designation of the type of the genus, or Stejneger's selection of *Anolis carolinensis* Voigt as the desired interpretation of Daudin's *Anolis bullaris* is accepted. We accordingly simply petition the Commission explicitly to sanction this conclusion, and so modify our first request of the original (1963) petition. The other two requests remain unquestioned.

If, however, the Commission rejects that reasoning and holds the Linnean name as the legally correct interpretation of Stejneger's type designation, we then vigorously call upon exercise of the plenary powers of the Commission to declare that designation null and void, as requested in our original petition.

The Linnean species is itself a composite and there is not, as in Daudin's description, any ground for selecting — except quite arbitrarily — any of the individual taxa confused under that name. The Linnean name derives entirely from plate 66 of Catesby, and Stimson & Underwood, who analysed all the information given by Catesby for plate 66, have themselves admitted that 'no one species fits all the facts given by Catesby'. We conclude that any one of the three taxa they indicate the name could apply to (*A. garmani, A. grahami grahami* and *A. g. aquarum*) could be assumed to be a synonym of *bullaris* Linnaeus by discounting some discrepancy of about the same magnitude for each taxon. It seems clear to us that Catesby was unable to distinguish the various green anoles of Jamaica, and very likely included in his concept taxa other than the three noted here. *Lacerta bullaris* of Linnaeus can therefore qualify only as a nomen dubium (as do other Linnean names, e.g. *Lacerta strumosa* Linnaeus 1758, cited by Daudin in the synonymy of his *bullaris*) and no attempt to limit the name to one taxon is justified. It remains, however, an occupied name [Art. 17(2)].

Sabrosky has pointed out that even if *Lacerta bullaris* Linnaeus 'could not be recognised to species, it might remain as the type species of the genus' and we agree that this is an acceptable option under the Code, for at least some Jamaican species is involved, and the name remains available. However, we strenuously object to such recourse either in this case or as a general proposition. It is poor taxonomic practice, not to be condoned officially (i.e., by the Commission) whether in individual cases or as a general policy (without extenuating circumstances, which are lacking in the present case), to leave either genera or species in limbo by failure to tie their names to the only secure anchor, a single entity, in spite of the fact that it is technically acceptable to settle for something less (i.e., for a genus, any of several species, or, for a species, any of several specimens to which its name could refer).

The objections to the requests in the original petition imply that no serious threat to stability exists by accepting Stejneger's type designation — accepted as implying *Lacerta bullaris* Linnaeus — and that no alteration or emendation of that designation by use of the plenary powers is therefore justified. On the contrary, stability is threatened by injudicious application of certain

automatic provisions of the Code, not primarily because of current taxonomy (although the present use of *Norops* Wagler by Savage and others for part of the genus may be a source of problems) but because of the ultimately inevitable division of this currently enormous assemblage of some 350 or more species-group taxa (species and subspecies), the most speciose reptile genus in the world. Sabrosky sagaciously pointed out that 'current revisers of the genus should certainly be consulted, lest a type fixation at this point fix the name *Anolis* on the smallest and least important section of the genus'. We agree; it is a critical consideration on which one of us (EEW) is an authority.

Acceptance of any Jamaican species of *Anolis* would, when the genus is partitioned, restrict that name to an unimportant section. The most important section is that containing *Anolis carolinensis* Voigt, 1832, whose literature is enormous, far exceeding that on all the rest of the genus together. To formalise now a type fixation for *Anolis* that would lead to the abandonment of that name (and use of *Xiphosurus* Fitzinger, 1826) for the section on which more research of every conceivable nature (experimental, physiological, anatomical and ecological as well as taxonomic) has been and undoubtedly will continue to be performed than on any other, would certainly not be conducive to nomenclatural stability and would give rise justifiably to the ire of the innumerable non-taxonomists affected. The threat to nomenclatural stability by the fixation of any Jamaican species is not an idle one; it is a certainty.

In brief, we reiterate our most urgent appeal to the Commission for its official acceptance of *Anolis carolinensis* Voigt as the type species of its genus, whether through invocation of Art. 70 of the Code, or through exercise of its plenary powers; and for its addition of both of those generic and specific names to the appropriate Official Lists, as we originally petitioned in 1963.

(2) By Andrew F. Stimson (*British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD*)

Williams & Smith's comment is well judged and takes into account several pertinent points that were not adequately expressed in the original application (Smith, Williams & Lazell, 1963).

My earlier comments (with Dr G. L. Underwood) were based on a belief that the *Anolis bullaris* of Daudin, a composite of several species, included true *bullaris* Linnaeus, and could not be regarded as a misidentified type-species in the sense of Article 70. This being the case, it seemed to us that there was not sufficient usage of component generic or subgeneric names within *Anolis* (sensu lato) to justify setting aside the Law of Priority by use of the plenary powers.

I agree that it was Stejneger's intention to designate as type species that part of *bullaris* Daudin currently known as *Anolis carolinensis* Voigt. Unfortunately Stejneger was not entitled to do this under the Rules. *A. bullaris* of Daudin was not equivalent to *A. carolinensis* but a composite of species including *carolinensis*. If Stejneger did have the right to designate *bullaris* sensu Daudin as type species, then the type species thus designated would have been the composite of Daudin and not that part of the composite singled out by Stejneger. However, I believe Stejneger did not have that right. Article 70b, cited by

Williams & Smith, actually begins 'If the type designated for a new nominal genus. . . .' In this case Stejneger did not designate the type species for a new genus but for a previously established one. As written, Article 70b does not cover type species designations for previously established nominal genera, nor in my view was it intended to.

In his comment Sabrosky wrote 'Daudin's *bullaris* was not a misidentification but a mixture of true *bullaris* and other forms now known to be distinct species. It cannot therefore be interpreted as a misidentified type species situation. . . .' I had earlier accepted this argument but, on reflection, I believe I was wrong to do so. It is true that Daudin's concept of the species included true *bullaris* inasmuch as he believed his material and Linnaeus' *bullaris* (i.e. Catesby's plate 66) to be conspecific. But the same must surely be true of any case of misidentified type species. An author would hardly use a name if he did not consider the type material of that species and his own material to belong to the same species. To accept Sabrosky's argument would be tantamount to accepting that there is no such thing as a misidentified type species.

I now believe that the misidentification referred to in Article 70a must be of the material actually before the author regardless of any cited references to material not seen by him. While it is clear that Daudin's material of *bullaris* comprised more than one species it is equally clear that it did not include any true *bullaris* Linnaeus. As indicated by Williams & Smith, the material seen by Daudin included at least one specimen collected 'en Caroline' by Bosc. There seems little doubt that *bullaris* of Daudin was based in part on the species now known as *Anolis carolinensis* Voigt.

I now agree with Williams & Smith that *Anolis bullaris* as used by Daudin, 1802 is a misidentified type species in the sense of Article 70a and that the plenary powers should be used to designate as type species of the genus *Anolis* Daudin a species actually before the author, namely *Anolis carolinensis* Voigt, 1832. I thus fully support the proposals contained in the original petition of Smith, Williams & Lazell, 1963.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS THE HOLOTYPE AND TO DESIGNATE A NEOTYPE FOR *GALAGO CRASSICAUDATUS* E. GEOFFROY, 1812 (PRIMATES, GALAGIDAE). Z.N.(S.) 2285

(see vol. 37, pp. 176–185)

By W. F. H. Ansell (*Trendrine, Zennor, St Ives, Cornwall, United Kingdom*)

It is surely desirable to retain the familiar and long standing specific name *crassicaudatus* and to be able to associate the nominate form with a definite locality. The type locality Quelimane, as designated by Thomas (1917, p. 48), does not do this because it lies within the zone of hybridisation between subspecies *monteiri* and the next properly distinguishable subspecies, which occupies the southern part of the species range. Dr Olson has, moreover, shown that Thomas was mistaken in supposing that Peters (1852, p. 292) was the first to identify the species with a definite locality because Sundevall had earlier (in van der Hoeven, 1844, p. 42) reported a specimen from 'near Port Natal in

Caffraria', i.e. near Durban, Natal. It therefore seems perfectly justifiable to set aside the type locality designated by Thomas. The neotype proposed by Olson is from a definite locality which is both within the range of the recognisably distinct southern subspecies and near enough to where Sundevall's specimen originated. It would fulfil the purpose of stabilising the nomenclature of the species. I therefore support both of Dr Olson's proposals.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A TYPE SPECIES FOR *INDODORYLAIMUS* ALI & PRABHA, 1974 (NEMATODA, DORYLAIMIDA) Z.N.(S.) 2335

(see vol. 39, pp. 57–58; vol. 39, p. 285)

(1) By M. R. Siddiqi (*Commonwealth Institute of Parasitology, Herts, U.K.*)

The application of Qaiser Baqri as published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, p. 285, states that he has designated a lectotype from the available syntypes, and I feel that the use of plenary powers to support this action is not called for. Article 74a of the International Code clearly provides for such an action of designating a syntype as lectotype and Baqri's action is justified.

With regard to the proposal to designate a type species for *Indodorylaimus* Ali & Prabha, 1974 (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 57–58), I strongly believe that *Thornenema wickeni* Yeates, 1970, a well documented species, is the type species of the genus *Indodorylaimus* Ali & Prabha, 1974, for the following three reasons:

1. *Indodorylaimus* n.gen. was proposed by Ali & Prabha, 1974 (*Nematologica* vol. 19, for 1973, p. 486) who fixed its type species thus:

Type species: *Indodorylaimus wickeni* (Yeates, 1970)

n.comb. (syn. *Thornenema wickeni* Yeates, 1970). *Thornenema wickeni* Yeates, 1970 is thus the original designation of the type species for *Indodorylaimus*, and is the type species regardless of other considerations (Art. 68a).

2. The reason for the creation of a new genus *Indodorylaimus* is given by the authors just before the generic diagnosis as follows:

'Yeates (1970) described *Thornenema wickeni* based on females. The female specimens described herein agree with his description in all essential measurements and in body characters. However the males of this species, reported herein for the first time, have a tail similar to that of the female necessitating removal of this species from *Thornenema* in which the tails of the sexes are dissimilar (elongate-filiform in females and short, bluntly conoid in males). Therefore a new genus *Indodorylaimus* is proposed for its inclusion under Prodorylaimidae.'

This clearly shows that the authors discussed the taxonomy of *Thornenema wickeni* Yeates and proposed a genus for its reception. (Note 'its inclusion' in the last sentence).

3. Ali & Prabha (1974) differentiated their new genus *Indodorylaimus* thus:

'*Indodorylaimus* is close to *Sicaguttur* from which it differs in having a mono-opisthodelphic gonad in the female and the first ventromedian supplement within the range of spicules in the male.'

Please note that the female characteristic is used first for the differentiation. *T. wickeni* is based on females only, and Ali & Prabha (1974) added male characteristics in the generic diagnosis of *Indodorylaimus* because they thought that their species with males was *T. wickeni.*

The genus *Indodorylaimus* may, or may not, be a valid genus, but another species viz., *Indodorylaimus elongatus* Baqri, 1982 (=*Indodorylaimus wickeni* apud Ali & Prabha, 1974) could not and should not be designated as the type species of *Indodorylaimus* Ali & Prabha, as discussed above.

(2) By Dr Q. H. Baqri (*Zoological Survey of India, Calcutta, 700016, India*)

In reply to the above comment by M. R. Siddiqi, nowhere in my application have I stated that the generic diagnosis of *Indodorylaimus* Ali & Prabha, 1974 is inadequate or that the description provided by the authors is poor. Rather, I have clearly stated that the type specimens of *Thornenema wickeni* Yeates, 1970 were compared with Ali & Prabha's specimens and the latter were found different in many characters. Hence, the specimens on which *Indodorylaimus* Ali & Prabha, 1974 was based were misidentified.

The species that was before Ali & Prabha had no valid name and was found to be a new species. In the circumstances (Article 49), I named the species *Indodorylaimus elongatus* Baqri, 1982 (=*I. wickeni* apud Ali & Prabha, 1974) and designated it as type species of *Indodorylaimus.* Article 72d has the provision that if an author proposes a new specific name expressly as a replacement for a prior name, it retains the type of the taxon bearing the prior name. Hence, Ali & Prabha's specimens were retained as types with the replaced name.

Articles 41, 49, 65b, 67j, and 70a deal with the misidentification of type species. Mayer, E. in his *Principles of Systematic Zoology*, p. 370, states that the principle on which such corrections (misidentification of types) are based is that the type of a taxon is not a name but the zoological object. The type (species or genus) is then the zoological object which the original author had before him (when making the type designation) and not the name which he may have erroneously attached to this object.

In light of the above, I find it rather difficult to accept the objection raised by Dr Siddiqi. To me it seems that Article 68a of the International Code is not applicable under the circumstances.

PROPOSAL TO EMEND Z.N.(S.) 2401 BY DESIGNATING *APIS PILIPES* AS TYPE SPECIES OF *MEGILLA* FABRICIUS

By Charles D. Michener (*Department of Entomology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045, U.S.A.*)

One aspect of a recent proposal (Michener, 1983) urged suppression of the first designation of a type species of the genus *Megilla* Fabricius, 1805. This action would validate the designation of *Apis acervorum* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Megilla* by Richards, 1935. My proposal was made with the objective of placing *Megilla* as a junior synonym of *Anthophora* Latreille, 1803.

I now realise that *Apis acervorum* Linnaeus has usually been misidentified. Day, 1979, places it as a species of *Bombus* Latreille, 1802, without a firm decision as to which one. (The type is believed lost). Løken (1973) places it in synonymy of *B. subterraneus* Linnaeus, 1758, without detailed explanation or neotype designation, and Day, 1979, so places it on page 81. Thomson, 1872, in a major work, also placed *Apis acervorum* as a synonym of *subterraneus* but most subsequent authors did not follow him.

The misidentification of *Apis acervorum* Linnaeus is of long standing, starting with Fabricius (1775), who referred to the ferruginous hind tibiae, a feature of *Anthophora 'acervorum'* but not of *Bombus subterraneus* or other *Bombus* species that could be the one named *acervorum* by Linnaeus. The misidentification was so generally accepted that Dalla Torre, 1896, cited 20 references to *acervorum* under *Anthophora* or genera synonymous with it and many others have appeared since 1896. It is obvious that Richards (1935), in designating *Apis acervorum* Linnaeus as the type species of *Megilla*, had the generally accepted misidentification in mind, for he indicated that *Megilla* would become a synonym of *Anthophora*, not of *Bombus*.

My original proposal would leave *Megilla* (which has not appeared in primary zoological literature in this century except to replace a homonym in 1916; see Michener, 1983) available to replace one or another subgeneric name in *Bombus* (e.g., *Subterraneobombus* Vogt, 1911, type species *Apis subterranea* Linnaeus, 1758 = ? *A. acervorum* Linnaeus, 1758), depending on decisions as to the identity of *Apis acervorum* Linnaeus. Nothing would be gained by destabilizing the subgeneric names of *Bombus* in this way.

I therefore emend my proposal (Michener, 1983) to request the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to designate *Apis pilipes* Fabricius, 1775, as the type species of *Megilla* Fabricius, 1805, and to invalidate all previous type designations for this genus. *A. pilipes* was one of the originally included species in *Megilla*. It is a synonym of *Apis plumipes* Pallas, 1772, which is the valid name for the *Apis acervorum* of authors, not Linnaeus, 1758. This designation will therefore accomplish Richards' intent as well as preserve the current usage of *Subterraneobombus* and *Macropis*.

REFERENCES

DALLA TORRE, C. G. DE 1896. *Catalogus Hymenopterorum* vol. 10, Apidae (Anthophila), viii + 643 pp.

DAY, M. C. 1979. The species of Hymenoptera described by Linnaeus in the genera *Sphex, Chrysis, Vespa, Apis* and *Mutilla*. *Biol. J. Linnean Soc. London* vol. 12, pp. 45–84.

FABRICIUS, J. C. 1775. *Systema Entomologiae*. Flensburgi and Lipsiae 8 + 30 + 832 pp.

LØKEN, A. 1973. Studies on Skandinavian bumble bees. *Norsk entomol. Tidsk.* vol. 20, pp. 1–218.

MICHENER, C. D. 1983. Proposal to suppress the first designation of a type species for the generic name *Megilla* Fabricius, 1805, and to place *Macropis* Klug, 1809, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology. *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 40, pp. 207–208.

RICHARDS, O. W. 1935. Notes on the nomenclature of the aculeate Hymenoptera, with special reference to British genera and species. *Trans. r. entomol. Soc. London* vol. 83, pp. 143–176.

THOMSON, C. G. 1872. *Skandinaviens Hymenoptera.* Lund. Tome 2, 286 pp.

EXPLICATION DU VOTE SUR LE PROJET DE LA TROISIEME EDITION DU CODE INTERNATIONAL DE NOMENCLATURE ZOOLOGIQUE. Z.N.(G.)197

par Claude Dupuis (*Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Paris*)

INTRODUCTION

Le Code de Nomenclature poursuivant des buts pratiques ne peut, à l'évidence, être ni un monument de philosophie, ni un modèle littéraire, ni un chef d'œuvre de droit international. Le projet actuel soulève, toutefois, des questions plus simples de méthode, de grammaire et de droit auxquelles, après un examen scrupuleux, je considère qu'il n'a pas su répondre, d'où mon vote contre.

Mon refus ne porte pas en général sur des dispositions réputées votées, mais sur des aspects que d'aucuns considèreront comme purement formels. En fait, ces aspects sont fondamentaux en ce qu'ils conditionnent l'intelligibilité d'un tel document, c'est à dire sa pédagogie implicite et, au total, son degré de réception ou de rejet par la communauté scientifique et non pas par celle des seuls taxinomistes s. strictissimo.

Ce qui suit est une énumération de mes principales raisons de refus.

I — FAIBLESSES DANS LA PRESENTATION DES PRATIQUES ET REGLES NOMENCLATORIALES

A *Mélange inextricable de ce qui est essentiel avec ce qui est accessoire*

L'exercice concret de la nomenclature zoologique fait appel à des règles de trois sortes:

— des règles fondamentalement liées à la pratique zoologique et qui concernent les relations entre des noms et des critères pour le choix de ces noms;

— des règles de droit extrazoologique;

— des microrègles de graphie.

Ces deux dernières sortes de règles expriment:

— des prescriptions provisoires et toujours susceptibles d'un démenti rapide par l'évolution des techniques (modalités d'impression) et des institutions (fonctionnement des Congrès et de la Commission);

— des détails infimes ou des listes interminables, et toujours incomplètes, afin que ce qui, substantiellement, est *un* même nom soit véritablement unique *à la lettre près* (comme l'exigent la stupidité et le coût des mémoires informatisées).

Malheureusement, tout ce qui est provisoire, infime ou énumératif est accessoire. Le mélange des éléments accessoires aux éléments essentiels conduit à sacrifier le général au particulier, ce qui risque

d'égarer le zoologiste de bonne foi dans un tel dédale qu'il ne pratiquera les règles qu'avec répugnance. Cet inconvénient est encore plus marqué dans le projet de la 3e édition que dans les éditions précédentes où je le déplorais déjà.

B *Longueur exagérée et numérotation malcommode des articles et paragraphes*

L'article 11 comprend 6 pages! La longueur moyenne d'un article est de 76/88 = 0,86 page. Il y a des alinéas de 12 lignes et plus!

Ou trouve 3 hiérarchies différentes de numérotation: 74(a)(ii), mais aussi 75(d)(2) et 9(1). Etant donné ce qu'il en coûte d'écrire, de lire et de composer les chiffres romains, les habitudes anglaises des i, ii, iii ... vii auraient bien dû être abandonnées au profit de chiffres arabes et de la séquence type 75(a)(1)(i).

C *Insuffisance de l'expression en langage courant*

D'une façon générale, l'expression du projet prête à *confusion*, en raison de l'emploi de tournures ou formules:

(1) *passives ou indirectes* (p. ex. 11c: 'Application de la nomenclature binominale requise' devrait se traduire par: 'Application of the requested binominal nomenclature', ce qui est ridicule. Le titre anglais 'Application of binominal nomenclature' est vide de signification. Il fallait la formule directe: *'Obligation* d'appliquer une nomenclature binominale', le premier mot de cette formule manquant dans le texte anglais):

(2) *négatives* (dans le glossaire, 'Conserver' est défini par 'supprimer (!!) des obstacles ...')

(3) *inversées* (61c définit le subjectif avant l'objectif);

(4) *désordonnées* (72a (ii) ordonne holotype, lectotype, néotypes, syntypes, alors que la logique opératoire est: holotype (73a), syntype (73b), lectotype (74), néotype (75).

Il y aurait eu lieu de procéder partout à un checking de ces insuffisances pour y remédier.

D *Défauts de l'expression technique*

Ces défauts apparaissent dans le texte actuel, par sa comparaison avec les textes antérieurs, et dans le glossaire:

(1) Dans le *texte* on relève:

— l'introduction d'*éléments de confusion* (nomenclatorial — seul admissible — et nomenclatural, qui rime tout simplement avec caricatural; nominal et nominatif);

— des mots *impropres* (introuvables dans les dictionnaires: anonymité!, adjectival! participial!) (pour ne rien dire des erreurs de traduction qui fourmillent);

— des *expressions différentes pour une même chose* (48: changement de genre, qui est mauvais; 51: transfert, qui est bon);

— des *formules trop restrictives* (69a vi doit s'appliquer aussi, et surtout, aux bibliographies *analytiques et critiques*).

(2) *Une comparaison avec les anciens textes montre:*

— l'abandon injustifié de bonnes *formules* ('pris à la lettre' est remplacé dans 76c par 'strictement interprêté' qui est faible);

— l'abandon de *concepts* indispensables (sauf peut être à la R6B, on a partout, y compris dans le glossaire, abandonné le concept de *catégorie* pour ceux plus équivoques de 'rank' et de 'groupe'; ce dernier est utilisé aussi bien pour des groupes de taxa que des groupes de catégories! Ce concept de catégorie est capital (1) par opposition à taxon et (2) pour bien faire comprendre la coordination nomenclatoriale qui résulte de la coordination taxinomique de certaines catégories).

(3) *Le Glossaire, à lui seul, justifie mon vote négatif*

Ce document est capital car 'il fait partie intégrante' du Code (cf. Préambule) (et non pas 'il est partie intégrante . . .'; en français on dit, dans ce cas, 'faire partie'; 'être partie' signifie être impliqué dans un litige).

(a) Mes critiques *de fond* sont les suivantes:

— les catégories sont définies par leur *position* hiérarchique, y compris *par rapport à des catégories facultatives* (la famille, le genre, par rapport à la sous-famille, au sous-genre . . .) et non pas par leur *composition* potentielle (une famille est, *avant tout, une réunion de genres,* etc. . . .);

— il y a des définitions insuffisantes (Caractère: un caractère sert aussi à *réunir* des taxa — Nom vernaculaire: il fallait opposer le parler courant au langage technique — Taxon subordonné: la définition donnée est fausse dans le cas où l'on compare, p. ex., une tribu et une famille ne présentant pas de rapports d'inclusion);

— il manque des définitions (p. ex. catégorie, coordination, errata . . .);

— il y a des contradictions (exclure de la notion d'hybride la descendance de sous-espèces est contraire au principe de coordination de l'espèce et de la sous-espèce, donc contraire au respect de la liberté taxinomique).

(b) Mes critiques *de forme* seraient innombrables. En voici quelques unes:

— 'reputé' (pourquoi avoir donné le verbe actif alors que la formule, au sens du Code, est toujours celle d'un adjectif?). Il faut définir clairement cet adjectif comme suit: reconnu, par l'effet de l'*usage* ou du *droit,* comme possédant une qualité non exprimée ou exprimée différemment dans les faits ou apparences;

— 'cas . . . 2) Désinence . . .(— Un cas grammatical n'a jamais été une désinence!

— 'nouvelle combinaison. La première . . .' — Une combinaison qui est *nouvelle* en ce sens ne l'est que par rapport à une combinaison préexistante;

— 'signe diacritique . . . indiquant différentes prononciations d'une lettre' — En réalité, il s'agit souvent de lettres différentes (cf. dictionnaires danois, espagnol, polonais . . .);

— 'spécimen tératologique . . . déformé' — Non! anormal ou monstrueux;

— 'substantif-phrase' (?) 'Nom composé' est correct; ne dites pas 'sa *terminaison* est *déterminée* . . .'

E *Insuffisances quant aux exemples*

— Certains demeurent encore purement formels, du type A-us (art. 22); ce ne sont pas des exemples, mais des conceptual constructs;

— Certains manquent (p. ex. en 6b);

— Certains sont mal ordonnés (p. 11 l'on trouve successivement deux exemples admis, puis un réfusé et, à nouveau, un admis!);

— Certains sont mal placés (l'exemple donné dans le Glossaire sous 'nom impropre' aurait dû figurer dans le texte). J'ajoute que *Pygoscelis* n'est pas un 'pingouin' (*Alcidae*) mais un 'manchot' (*Spheniscidae*) et que, de toutes manières, des noms vernaculaires tels que Pingouin n'ont rien à faire dans le Code!

F *Réglementation différente d'abus semblables*

La désignation des lectotypes et néotypes fait, de nos jours, l'objet de nombreux abus. Sa réglementation par les articles 74–75 est insuffisante. J'estime qu'il y a trois règles qui devraient s'appliquer *également* à ces deux sortes de types:

1) La désignation des lectotypes et néotypes ne constitue pas une fin *nomenclatoriale* en soi (ceci est dit en 75c, mais il n'y a rien de semblable sous 74).

2) La désignation des lectotypes et néotypes doit, en conséquence, échapper à la routine muséologique et n'être admise que dans le cadre d'un travail de révision, etc . . . (ceci est dit en 75b mais il n'y a rien de semblable sous 74) (au surplus, sous 74b(i) et (ii), il fallait également préciser une étude *zoologique* critique, comme l'on précise un problème *zoologique* complexe sous 74b (ii)).

3) Toute désignation de lectotype et de néotype doit être compatible avec les restrictions exprimées par les *réviseurs* antérieurs, etc. . . (c'est la R 74 A, mais il n'y a rien de semblable sous 75, même pas en

75d (4). J'ajoute que ceci ne devrait pas constituer une Recommandation, mais une règle impérative et que je trouve une contradiction à ce sujet entre la règle 74a (ii) et la Recommandation 74A. C'est le point évoqué ci-dessous.

G *La notion de 1er Réviseur et des droits afférents (qui est une garantie de stabilité) est trop restrictive*

A l'article 24a et dans le Glossaire ('réviseur') la notion du 1er réviseur est bornée à l'auteur d'un choix entre deux noms ou actes *simultanés*. Ceci est insuffisant.

Le choix d'un lectotype, une émendation de nom, le réexamen d'un type, etc. . . sont, chacun en leur domaine, des *premières révisions*. Il y a autant d'actions de *révision* que d'actions nomenclatoriales *et taxinomiques* concevables (d'ailleurs le mot *révision* est donné avec son sens taxinomique en 75b (i) comme il devrait l'être en 75b (ii).

Le principe du 1er réviseur au sens général est un *corollaire* du principe de priorité. C'est de lui que procède, en particulier, l'obligation d'effectuer certaines désignations *dans le respect des actes antérieurs*. J'ajoute que, dans les définitions de 'rejeter' et 'préséance', l'on devrait, de ce fait, trouver d'abord mention des procédures courantes de première révision et *ensuite seulement* mention des actions exceptionnelles de la Commission.

II — FAIBLESSES DANS L'EXPOSE DES FAITS GRAMMATICAUX

A bien des égards et dès sa 1ère édition, le Code n'a pas réussi à maitriser l'expression des faits grammaticaux, ce qui a entraîné les bévues les plus singulières (p. ex. parce qu'on a voulu 'simplifier' le cas des génitifs des noms de personnes, on a institué la recette de cuisine du *i* — ou *ii* sur quoi, bien évidemment, je m'abstiens — d'où, de la part de toutes sortes de zoologistes, l'adjonction pure et simple d'un *i* à tout et n'importe quoi: noms de pays, noms d'hôtes, etc. . . etc. . .). Lorsqu'on veut remplacer une pratique issue des cervaux par une recette ou une énumération faite pour les machines, *l'on égare les lecteurs* et l'on s'engage dans une procédure sans fin.

Le cas de l'homonymie, auquel je limiterai mes remarques, est révélateur. La définition de l'homonymie peut être à la fois étymologique, sémantique et orthographique.

Dans le cas de la nomenclature zoologique, il me parait qu'il serait plus économique de la définir d'abord comme étymologique et sémantique.

Des noms de taxa qui ont la même étymologie et la même signification, dans leur radical et leurs suffixes, sont homonymes (les noms de genres directement entre eux, les noms d'espèces pour autant que combinés à un même nom de genre), qu'ils ne diffèrent pas ou qu'ils diffèrent par une ou plusieurs lettres ne concernant ni l'étymologie, ni la signification.

C'est ce que reconnaît l'article 58; à l'énumération qu'il donne on pourrait ajouter sans fin:

londinensis et londonensis!!!
coreocoris et corecoris
. . . myia et . . . mya
. . . ites, ithes, ytes
. . . ii et . . . i
McGillivrayia et McGillivraya
Yakovlevi et Jakovlevi
Pawlowskyi et Pavlovskyi

et toutes les variantes de translittération (du grec, du russe, du chinois, etc . . .) de voyelles de liaison, de lettres intercalaires accidentelles, etc. . . etc. . .

Le caractère ouvert et indéfini de la liste des exceptions possibles démontre que l'*on ne peut pas résoudre la question par une énumération.*

Au lieu d'énumérer incomplètement les cas d'homonymies étymologiques et sémantiques qu'il faut bien reconnaître en dépit de la définition orthographique de l'homonymie, il faut, à l'inverse, écarter cette définition orthographique et dire simplement les cas où les noms étymologiquement homonymes ne le seront pas en regard du Code (peut-être n'y a-t-il que le cas des noms génériques fondés sur un nom de personne et différents par leur genre grammatical).

Cette simplification exigerait, certes, un important travail de remise en chantier d'articles 'votés'(?) car elle aurait des incidences — elles aussi simplificatrices — sur la question des orthographes subséquentes et des homonymies secondaires (de noms de familles).

De toutes manières, je vote contre la définition orthographique de l'homonymie et contre ce qu'il y a de contradictoire dans le projet à ce sujet entre les articles 56, 57 et 58.

III — ASPECTS JURIDIQUES DU PROJET

(A) *Equivalence des textes*

Il est *bon* que le Code soit officiellement bilingue (et j'ai toujours souhaité qu'il devienne trilingue). Ceci est, de plus, nécessaire à son expression la meilleure possible. Lorsqu'un texte en langue A est produit simultanément en langue B, ses faiblesses dans la langue A apparaissent et il peut être retravaillé, comme sera à son tour retravaillé le texte

B, et ceci jusqu'à obtention de deux textes à la fois parfaitement équivalents et, surtout, constituant en deux langues le meilleur texte possible.

La procédure suivie pour le projet n'a jamais été celle-là. Il s'ensuit que le projet en français, tel qu'il a été soumis, est inacceptable et que le projet en anglais n'est pas ce qu'il aurait pu être.

(B) *Fondement juridique du texte*

Il m'a bien paru qu'à Helsinki la Section de Nomenclature (dont la division de Zoologie a avalisé les propositions) n'était autre que la Commission, qui avait simplement changé de président pour la circonstance. En ces conditions, j'ai cru devoir m'épargner la peine d'examiner si les instructions que la Commission s'était données à elle-même à Helsinki avaient été correctement suivies. J'aurais aimé que la question réciproque (le editorial Committee n'a-t-il pas introduit des questions non traitées à Helsinki?) soit soumise à un vote. Ceci m'aurait éclairé sur le fondement en droit des dispositions nouvelles relatives aux noms 'interpolés' que je repousse.

(C) *Pleins pouvoirs de la Commission* (cette formule devant toujours être au pluriel, et non pas au singulier comme dans le Glossaire)

Il est indispensable qu'une commission d'experts puisse donner, avec les pleins pouvoirs, dans un domaine défini, son avis sur les cas particuliers échappant aux prescriptions du Code. S'il s'agit véritablement de 'pleins pouvoirs', je ne comprends pas qu'on astreigne la Commission à des directives (50b, 70b, 55).

(D) *Appendices*

Aux termes de l'article 87, les Appendices ne font pas plus partie du Code que les exemples et recommandations (ce qui est, dans les trois cas, contestable). Or, alors que les exemples et recommandations ont été soumis au vote avec l'ensemble du texte, les appendices ne l'ont pas été. Ils seront, néanmoins, publiés simultanément. Il y a là une ambigüité sur la responsabilité comparée des commissaires (ceux qui ont le droit de faire des appendices et ceux qui ne l'ont pas).

(E) *Statut des textes et décisions antérieurs*

Je ne suit pas d'accord avec le libellé de l'article 84b qui *annule* toutes les éditions et décisions antérieures. C'est dans ces documents (dont on ne s'est pas assez soucié) que se trouve l'essentiel du fondement juridique et historique du projet. Il eût été préférable de déclarer: 'Toutes les dispositions des éditions antérieures . . . et tous les amendements . . . *contraires à la présente édition sont abrogés*'.

Pour l'ensemble de ces raisons, je ne pouvais émettre d'autre vote que négatif. Je regrette de devoir prendre cette décision à l'égard d'un texte élaboré pas des experts en nomenclature, compétents et sérieux, qui ont beaucoup travaillé et qui ont toute mon estime. Je crains, ou bien qu'ils aient eu le malheur de se laisser subjuguer par l'édition précédente, ce qui ne pouvait conduire qu'à la compliquer, ou bien de m'être personnellement imaginé que les zoologistes avaient besoin d'un Code élagué, triant l'essentiel et l'accessoire, écrit dans un langage directement accessible et purgé de contradictions et confusions.

En émettant mon vote, c'est, en effet, aux zoologistes dans leur ensemble, et non pas seulement aux seuls taxinomistes ou nomenclatorialistes, que j'ai pensé avant tout. Si tous les zoologistes parviennent à faire de la 3ème édition (supposée adoptée) un usage meilleur que des précédentes, ce que je souhaite, je reconnaitrai volontiers que le progrès, de nos jours, n'est pas à chercher dans la clarté d'un ensemble mais dans la complication des détails.

INTERNATIONAL CODE OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE: AMENDMENT PROPOSED TO THIRD EDITION: PROPOSAL CONCERNING ARTICLE 51c. Z.N.(S.)2474

By R. J. Gagné & F. C. Thompson (*Systematic Entomology Laboratory, USDA, c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington D.C. 20560, U.S.A.*) and L. V. Knutson (*II B III USDA, Beltsville Agricultural Research Center, West Beltsville, Maryland 20705, U.S.A.*)

Article 51c of the Code prescribes the use of parentheses in new combinations. If a species-group taxon was described in a given genus and later transferred to another, the name of the author of the species-group name, if cited, is to be enclosed in parentheses.

2. When recombinations were rarer than they are today, this convention may have been useful to indicate whether a researcher needed to consult other combinations than the current one. Now, when combinations different from the original are in the majority, in some groups approaching 100% of included species, and when species are indexed either by specific epithet or present combination, use of the parentheses is superfluous.

3. Use of the parentheses is expensive and time consuming. The Insect Identification and Beneficial Insect Introduction Institute, SEA, AR, U.S. Department of Agriculture, is ultimately responsible for checking all insect names in departmental manuscripts and reports. Parentheses are among the items checked. Often, research entomologists of that Institute are asked to provide just that information, which is of no interest to the writers or readers of the reports. The Institute has also found that computer programming is more expensive with this convention because the opening and closing parentheses add a complication when retrieving authors' names.

4. Although the convention is generally adhered to, notable exceptions to its use exist in the scientific literature without adverse effect. Lindner, E., 1926–present, and Crosskey, 1980, have dispensed with it. In the latter case, a taxonomic catalogue, the original genus, if different from the current genus, follows closely the species citation, so enclosing an author's name in parentheses seems superfluous. But in Lindner, 1926–present, the names of authors of specific taxa that should have parentheses have none even in discussions or figure captions. To quote from Crosskey, 1980: 'The editors ... hold the view that Article 51c of the [second edition of the] Code is one of its most negative, and therefore useless requirements — its only effect is to convey the rather worthless information that a species no longer remains in the genus where it was first placed. Much valuable research time has been wasted

by specialists in searching out 'whether the author's name should be in brackets', and mandatory Article 51c should in our view be eliminated from the Code or reduced to the status of a recommendation for revisionary works alone'.

5. We strongly agree with Crosskey and propose that Article 51c of the third edition be deleted from the Code because it serves a negligible purpose incommensurate to the time and labour involved. We do not feel that the convention should be maintained even as a recommendation because we prefer uniform application.

REFERENCES

CROSSKEY, R. W. (edit.) 1980. Catalogue of the Diptera of the Afrotropical region. *Brit. Mus. (nat. Hist.), London,* 1437 pp.

LINDNER, E. (edit.) 1926–present. *Die Fliegen der palaearktischen Region.* Stuttgart (Schweizerbart).

INTERNATIONAL CODE OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE: PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THIRD EDITION: ARTICLE 59b. Z.N.(S.)2475

By Z. Boucek (*Commonwealth Institute of Entomology, London*)

I am unhappy with the wording and meaning of Article 59b in the third edition of the Code. It makes invalid the original name of a species in favour of a replacement name because of a junior homonymy in a genus to which the original name was transferred. The provision was apparently introduced for automatic nomenclatural validation of some names, in better-known groups, where usage of the replacement name greatly exceeds usage of the original name.

2. However, in less well known groups in many cases the original name was used once and the replacement name virtually also once, so that there is no 'established usage' of either of them. The original and the replacement names (epithets) are, in fact, in the same relation as objective synonyms, and the present edition gives automatic precedence to the junior objective synonym. This is contrary to the spirit of our Code, i.e. the axial Principle of Priority.

3. May I suggest the following amendment to Article 59b:

(b) Homonyms replaced before 1961. — When a replacement name proposed before 1961 for a junior secondary homonym has acquired wide use, the relevant junior secondary homonym is permanently invalid.

(i) If the replacement has not been widely used, and if, after another generic transfer, the replaced name is no longer a junior secondary homonym, the replaced original name becomes again nomenclaturally valid and competes with other names under the Principle of Priority, as in Section d of this Article.

(ii) Doubtful cases should be submitted to the Commission for a decision under its plenary power [Art. 79].

REQUEST FOR A DECLARATION CLARIFYING THE MEANING OF THE EXPRESSIONS 'SUPPRESSED FOR NOMENCLATURAL PURPOSES' AND 'REJECTED FOR NOMENCLATURAL PURPOSES' AND THE STATUS OF INFORMATION IN WORKS THAT ARE REJECTED UNDER ARTICLES 8 AND 9 OF THE CODE. Z.N.(S.)2476

By L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, Netherlands*), W. D. L. Ride (*Canberra College of Advanced Education, Canberra, Australia*) and C. W. Sabrosky (*Systematic Entomology Laboratory, c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington DC 20560, U.S.A.*)

The International Code of Zoological Nomenclature distinguishes only two classes of works: those that are 'published' within the meaning of Article 8, and unpublished works.

2. But for a name or nomenclatural act to be available, it must also be contained in a work that was published after 1757 [Art. 11a]; it must have been published in a work in which the author had consistently applied the Principle of Binominal Nomenclature [Art. 11c]; and, if published after 1950, it must not be anonymous [Art. 14].

3. On the other hand, works that meet only the criteria of Article 8 (but not also those of paragraph 2 above) may be the published sources of descriptions or illustrations that may provide the bases for the establishment of new names under Articles 12 and 13 by bibliographic reference.

4. In the past the Commission has given Opinions that certain works are 'suppressed for nomenclatorial purposes' or 'rejected for nomenclatorial purposes' and recorded these rulings in the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoological Nomenclature (in the Code the spelling 'nomenclatural' is used; it is used elsewhere in this proposal, except when quoting).

5. At present it is not clear whether the expressions 'rejected for nomenclatorial purposes' and 'suppressed for nomenclatorial purposes' are of equivalent effect on the works so described. Are such works totally rejected or suppressed (i.e. have they the same status in nomenclature as manuscripts) or may they be used as sources of illustrations or descriptions as though they were works published before 1758? (see paragraph 3 above).

6. In preparing the third edition of the Code it has become apparent that a ruling must be obtained to clarify the expressions used by the Commission in its Opinions.

STATUS OF WORKS UNDER THE CODE

7. *Unpublished works:* Works that do not meet the criteria of Article 8 (or are rejected under Article 9) have the status, in zoological nomenclature, of unpublished works; that is, they have the same status as manuscripts.

8. *Works published before 1758:* Works published prior to 1758, even if they meet the criteria of Article 8, are not sources in which names can be made available. Since nomenclatural acts, such as type fixation, selection using the First Reviser principle, and allocation of species to a genus described without originally included species, can only be done following the establishment of an available name, it follows that none of them can be accepted from a pre-1758 work. However such works have been regarded, since the time of Linnaeus, as published sources of illustrations or descriptions that can be cited by bibliographic reference in order to establish a name (e.g. by indication under Article 12 of the third edition).

9. *Non-binominal works:* Published works that are not wholly binominal [Art. 11c] have the same status as works published before 1758; names and nomenclatural acts published in such works cannot be available.

10. *Anonymous works:* Names published anonymously after 1950 are not available [Art. 14]. This provision should be extended to cover also nomenclatural acts published in such works.

11. *Rejected and suppressed works:* Although the difference in meaning between 'rejected works' and 'suppressed works' may not be evident to the casual reader, analysis of the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoological Nomenclature reveals that 'rejected works' are those that are held by the Commission not to meet the 'normal provisions of the *Règles*' (Hemming, 1958, Introductory Note to the Official Index, paragraph 7). In this sense, rejection is an action that can be taken by any zoologist with regard to a work in which 'the author did not consistently apply the Principle of Binominal Nomenclature' or to a work 'published before 1 January 1758, the starting point of zoological nomenclature'. On the other hand, 'suppressed works' are those on which official action is taken by the Commission using its plenary power [Art. 79] even though the work satisfies the criteria of Article 8 (or possibly so), but for reasons of conserving later names or acts, is deemed to be a threat to stability and thus meet to be suppressed.

12. Nowhere in the Code or the Official Index is it made clear whether works that are rejected or suppressed have the status of manuscripts (i.e. works that do not meet the criteria of Article 8 or have been rejected under Article 9) or whether they have the status of published works referred to in paragraphs 8 to 10 above.

DRAFT DECLARATION A

13. The Commission is asked to insert words into Chapter III of the Code to make it clear that

(a) suppressed and rejected works all have the same status in zoological nomenclature, i.e. a work rejected by a zoologist or the Commission on any of the following grounds:
  (i) that it was published before 1758; or
  (ii) that it has been suppressed by the Commission by the use of the plenary power; or
  (iii) that the author did not consistently apply the Principle of Binominal Nomenclature; or
  (iv) that it was published anonymously after 1950
  is not a work in which a new name can be established or any of the following nomenclatural acts be done:
  (1) fixation of the name-bearing type of a taxon at any rank in the family group, the genus group or the species group, including the subsequent reference of one or more nominal species to a genus established without included species;
  (2) any of the actions admissible under the Principle of the First Reviser;
  (3) emendation, justified or unjustified;
  but such works may be used as published sources to which bibliographic reference can be made for published illustrations or descriptions to make available a newly published name under the provisions of Articles 12 and 13 (of the third edition);
(b) the expressions 'rejected for nomenclatural purposes' and 'suppressed for nomenclatural purposes' used by the Commission with reference to works shall be defined as in (a) above, subject to any qualification expressly stated in the relevant Opinion; and
(c) a work that does not satisfy the provisions of Article 8 or that is rejected under Article 9 has the status in zoological nomenclature of a manuscript, that is, it is unpublished for all the purposes of the Code.

COMPLETION OF RULING

14. The term 'available' is not used in the Code itself in connexion with works, but is used in the title and introduction of the Official List of Works Approved as Available for Zoological Nomenclature following a decision at Copenhagen in 1953 that

'Where, on the application of specialists, the International

Commission either (a) declares to be available, or (b) validates, for nomenclatorial purposes, a given work, the name of that work (together with its author and date) shall be placed on an 'Official List' to be styled the *Official List of Works Approved as Available for Zoological Nomenclature.*' (*Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nom.*, p. 24, decision 24).

In this context, and subject to any qualification imposed by the Commission using its plenary power [Art. 79], the use of the terms 'available' and 'validated' confers equal status.

DRAFT DECLARATION B

15. We request the Commission to insert words in Chapter III of the Code to make it clear that

(a) the terms 'available' and 'validated' when used in connexion with a work in zoological nomenclature shall be interpreted to mean that the work so described is, or is deemed by the Commission to be, a work that is published under Article 8 and is not excluded from use for any other nomenclatural purpose (such as establishing new names, fixation of name-bearing types, selection under the Principle of the First Reviser, etc.) by any provision of the Code;

(b) the term 'available work' be used to describe such a work; and

(c) any work so described may nevertheless be partially restricted in use or suppressed by the Commission using its plenary power and any such limitation or suppression shall be expressed in an Opinion.

A PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 70b OF THE INTERNATIONAL CODE OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE ON MISIDENTIFIED TYPE SPECIES. Z.N.(S.)2477

By Curtis W. Sabrosky (*Systematic Entomology Laboratory, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.*)

There is ample evidence in the literature that in cases where it is or becomes very clear that a type species was misidentified, authors commonly do not bother to apply to the Commission but go ahead and recognize the species actually involved as type species. This maintains stability and universality, and therefore it is difficult to fault such actions even though they are in technical violation of Article 70b of the code.

2. *A Catalog of the Diptera of America North of Mexico* (1965) illustrates the immensity of the problem, at least in the field of entomology. The individual cataloguers of families listed a total of 51 genera and 3 subgenera in 25 families as having misidentified type species. Two of the generic names are junior homonyms, but both are involved in the type species of their replacement names. Twelve are synonyms in current classification. The editors allowed the cataloguers to recognize the actual species rather than the named species, if they preferred for reasons of stability, but only one chose to adopt the named species. The editors pointed out (Introduction, p. 9) that 'To conform to nomenclature requirements, application should be made to the International Commission, but time did not permit securing the necessary decisions for this catalog'.

3. For a different continent and many different authors, the *Catalogue of the Diptera of the Afrotropical Region* (R. W. Crosskey, ed.) [British Museum (Nat. Hist.), 1980] covered a fauna of similar size, 16,318 species and 2,009 genera compared to 16,130 species and 1,971 genera for America north of Mexico. The editors positively accepted the actual species involved, but misidentified, as the type species. Thus, in the 'Explanatory information on the Catalogue text' (pp. 21–22):

'If the nominal type-species was misidentified, so that the actual type-species is different from the putative type-species, the existence of misidentification and the original binomen, author and date, of the valid name of the actual species involved are shown, e.g. "Type-species: *Ocyptera pusilla* Meigen, 1824, sensu Robineau-Desvoidy [misident., = *Tachina biguttata* Meigen, 1824]", (thus the type-species is *biguttata* Meigen which Robineau-Desvoidy mistakenly identified as *pusilla* Meigen)'.

4. The Afrotropical Catalogue recorded 30 genera and 7 subgenera in 23 families as having misidentified type species. Of these one name was a homonym and 9 are currently in synonymy. Because some

old and widespread genera are involved, 15 of the problem cases occur in both catalogs, but the Afrotropical Catalogue still adds a sizeable number.

5. I believe that the Commission should be saved the work and trouble of considering clearcut cases, and taxonomists should be saved the time and effort of preparing them for the Commission and the time of waiting (sometimes) years for a decision. There must, of course, be provision for challenge, and then the case can be considered by the Commission. Meanwhile the great majority of such cases need not reach the Commission at all.

6. Accordingly, I propose that Article 70b (of 3rd edition, = 70a of 1961, 1964 editions) be amended as follows, and that a new 70c be inserted, with present 70c becoming 70d:

(b) Misidentified type species. — If, however, a person discovers that a type species was misidentified, or considers that a misidentification has clearly occurred, he or she is to continue to regard as type species the species that was actually involved, but under its correct name, and not the species represented by the name incorrectly applied to the type species.

(c) Commission action on misidentified type species. — If there is disagreement on the misidentification or on the identity of the species actually involved, the case is to be referred to the Commission with appropriate documentation and a proposal that the Commission designate as type species, by use of the plenary power when necessary, the nominal species that will best serve stability and universality of nomenclature, either

(i) the nominal species named in the fixation of the type species, regardless of its misidentification; or

(ii) the species actually involved, which was wrongly named in the type fixation, or

(iii) if the identity of the misidentified species is doubtful, a nominal species chosen in conformity with the usage of the generic or subgeneric name prevailing at the time the misidentification is discovered; or

(iv) if the Commission considers that none of these alternatives is appropriate it may designate any nominal species to be the type species.

7. Subsections (ii) to (iv) are virtually the same as in (i) to (iii) of Article 70b of the 3rd edition of the Code, and Subsections (i) to (iii) are virtually the same, in a different sequence, as (i) to (iii) of 70a of the 1961 and 1964 editions.

(8) The compact formats adopted in the two catalogs illustrate slightly different ways of representing the result, thus:

Anthrax Scopoli, 1763: 358. Type-species, *Musca morio* Linnaeus (mon.; misident.) = *Anthrax anthrax* (Schrank). [North American Catalog.]

Anthrax Scopoli, 1763: 358. Type-species: *Musca morio* Linnaeus, 1758, sensu Scopoli [misident., =*Musca anthrax* Schrank, 1781], by monotypy. [Afrotropical Catalogue].

COMMENT ON DR SABROSKY'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 70

By the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

Dr Sabrosky's proposed amendment to Article 70 would, if adopted, undoubtedly save the Secretariat of the Commission a great deal of work and is to be welcomed on that score. It contains within itself, however, a difficulty that he has not perceived: it would put Article 70b in direct conflict with Articles 67e and 69a(i) (of the third edition). These provisions prescribe, first, that only the actions of the original author made when a nominal genus or subgenus is established are relevant in deciding what are the species originally included in that taxon (Article 67 g further provides that a species that was not originally included cannot be the type species); and, secondly, what species can be accepted as the originally included species.

In most cases about misidentified type species, the species that is preferred for designation was not originally included; in many cases it was only established later than the genus in question; in some cases it has no name of its own at the time when the misidentification is discovered. His proposed paragraph b would be unexceptional if it were confined to cases where the species before the designator was an originally included species; but so to restrict his proposal would deprive it of nearly all its usefulness.

The solution to this conflict is not immediately apparent to me. I hope readers of the *Bulletin* will put forward proposals.

WILLIAMIA MONTEROSATO, 1884 (MOLLUSCA, GASTROPODA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION. Z.N.(S.)2237

By Harald B. Rehder (*National Museum of Natural History, Washington D.C. 20560, U.S.A.*)

In 1887, [30 June] (see outside back wrapper), p. 210, Mörch proposed the name *Allerya* for a subgenus of *Piliscus* Lovén, 1859 containing two species of limpet-shaped pulmonate mollusks, *Ancylus gussoni* O. G. Costa, 1829, and *Piliscus (Allerya) krebsii* new species (Mörch, 1877a, p. 210). In another paper that appeared several months later (but not later than [31 October 1877], see inside front wrapper) Mörch used the name *Allerya,* again for a subgenus of *Piliscus,* with only one species included, *Piliscus (Allerya) krebsii,* which he stated was 'close to *P. gussoni*'.

2. In 1877 Monterosato erected the genus *Scutulum* for *Ancylus gussoni* O. G. Costa (Monterosato, 1877, p. 427). In 1884, p. 150, Monterosato proposed the replacement name *Williamia* for *Allerya* Mörch, which he claimed was preoccupied by *Allerya* Bourguignat, 1876. He also pointed out that his own name *Scutulum* was preoccupied by *Scutulum* Tournouër, 1870. Monterosato considered that Bourguignat's name *Allerya* dated from the month in which he (Monterosato) submitted Bourguignat's paper (Bourguignat, 1878) for publication.

3. Bourguignat's paper, in which he proposed *Allerya* for three small land snails from Sicily, now in the family ENODONTIDAE, had been transmitted by him, apparently through Monterosato, to the Royal Academy of Science, Letters and Art in Palermo, Sicily. Monterosato translated it from French into Italian and submitted the manuscript to the Academy for publication according to the note after the author's name in the publication. However, the title page of vol. 6 bears the dates 1876–79, and part 3, in which Bourguignat's paper appeared, could not have been published before 1878 and probably appeared in that year. Neave, 1939, p. 115, has already pointed out that *Allerya* Bourguignat should be dated from 1878, and that *Williamia* was proposed as a replacement name in error (Neave, 1940, p. 657).

4. In 1895, p. 137, Cossmann designated *Patella gussoni* O. G. Costa as type species of *Williamia* (in which it was the only originally included species, hence type species by monotypy), which he used as a subgenus of *Siphonaria.* As synonyms of *Williamia* he listed *Scutulum* Monterosato, 1877, non Tournouër, 1870, and *Allerya* Mörch, 1877, non Bourguignat, 1876 [sic]. According to Article 67i of the Code this type-species designation applies both to *Williamia* and to *Allerya* Mörch, for which no earlier type-species designation has been found.

5. *Allerya* Mörch, 1877, in the family SIPHONARIIDAE, is thus one year earlier than *Allerya* Bourguignat, 1878 and becomes therefore a nomenclaturally valid name. It should replace *Williamia* Monterosato, 1884, a name that has been in use for 100 years for a world-wide genus of pulmonate limpets. It is found in such general treatises as Zilch, 1959, p. 84 and Franc, 1968, p. 522; faunal works as Abbott, 1974, p. 336; Keen, 1971, p. 852; Kuroda & Habe in Habe, 1961, Appendix, p. 33; Kay, 1979, p. 493; and Rehder, 1980, p. 98; and in taxonomic papers such as Hubendick, 1946, p. 70; Donohue, 1965, p. 19; and Marshall, 1981, p. 487. According to the last-named author, p. 487, *Allerya* Mörch has been used only once, by Habe, 1964, p. 144, since its establishment for this group of pulmonate limpets.

6. The name *Allerya* Bourguignat, 1878, was proposed for three species of small land snails from Sicily that are now considered to be members, either as valid names or as synonyms, of the genus *Discus* Fitzinger, 1833, p. 99, in the family ENODONTIDAE (Zilch, 1959, p. 227).

7. In 1862 Bourguignat proposed the generic name *Brondelia* (p. 20) for two species of supposedly freshwater limpets from Algeria, one of which he had described eight years earlier (Bourguignat, 1854, p. 92) as *Ancylus drouetianus*. This species, which has been designated as type species of *Brondelia* by Rehder, 1984, p. 84, was originally described and figured from a specimen in the Cuming Collection and was said to have come from North America. The type specimen is lost or missing, but from the adequate description and good figure it without doubt represents a species of *Williamia*, and probably *W. gussoni*, the type species of *Williamia* (Rehder, 1984, p. 84). *Brondelia* Bourguignat has never been used for the group of pulmonate limpets now known as *Williamia* Monterosato, and therefore I request that this name also be suppressed.

8. In order to preserve the name *Williamia* Monterosato as currently used, and to avoid the confusion that would result from the strict application of the Law of Priority in this case, I ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to:

(1) use its plenary powers to suppress for the purposes of the Law of Priority, but not for those of the Law of Homonymy, the generic names

(a) *Allerya* Mörch, 1877, and

(b) *Brondelia* Bourguignat, 1862;

(2) place the generic name *Williamia* Monterosato, 1884 (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Ancylus gussoni* O. G. Costa, 1829, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) place the specific name *gussoni* O. G. Costa, 1829, as published in the binomen *Ancylus gussoni* (specific name of type species of *Williamia* Monterosato, 1877) on the Official

List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) place the generic names (a) *Allerya* Mörch, 1877 and (b) *Brondelia* Bourguignat, 1862, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

ABBOTT, R. T. 1974. *American Seashells,* 2nd edit., 663 pp., 6405 figs, 24 pls. New York.

BOURGUIGNAT, J. R. 1854. Descriptions d'ancyles nouveaux, de la collection de M. Cuming, précédée d'une courte notice sur le genre *Ancylus* et d'un catalogue complet des espèces qui le composent. *Proc. zool. Soc. London,* vol. 21, pp. 76–93.

—— 1862. Notices monographiques sur les genres *Gundlachia, Poeyia,* et *Brondelia. Rev. Mag. Zool.* (2) vol. 14, pp. 12–23.

—— 1878. Monographia del nuovo genere Siciliano *Allerya. Atti Acad. Sci., Lett. Arte Palermo,* n.s. vol. 6 (3), pp. 1–7, 5 figs.

COSSMANN, M. 1895. *Essais de Paléoconchologie comparée,* fasc. 1. Paris, Author.

COSTA, O. G. 1829. *Osserv. geol. intorno di testa ... Pantelleria.* Napoli.

DONOHUE, J. 1965. Concerning *Williamia peltoides* (Carpenter). *Veliger,* vol. 8 (1), pp. 19–21.

FITZINGER, L. J. 1833. Systematisches Verzeichniss der im Erzherzogthum Oesterreich vorkommenden Weichthiere. *Beitr. Verein vaterl. Gesch., Statistik, Topogr.,* vol. 3, pp. 88–122.

FRANC, J. 1968. Sous-classe des Pulmonés, in Grassé, ed., *Traité de Zoologie,* vol. 5, fasc. 3, pp. 325–607, figs 173–309.

HABE, T. 1961. *Coloured illustrations of shells of Japan,* vol. 2, 183 pp. Osaka.

—— 1964. *Shells of the western Pacific in colour,* vol. 2, 233 pp., 66 pls. Osaka.

HUBENDICK, G. 1946. Systematic monograph of the Patelliformia. *K. svenska Vetenskaps Akad. Handl.,* (3) vol. 23 (5), pp. 1–93, 6 pls.

KAY, E. A. 1979. *Hawaiian marine shells,* xvi+653 pp., 195 figs. Honolulu.

KEEN, M. 1971. *Sea shells of tropical west America,* 2nd edit., xvi+1064 pp., figs, 22 pls. Stanford.

LOVEN, S. 1859. Om Molluskslägtet *Pilidium* Midd. *Ofvers. k. Vetenskaps Akad. Förhandl.,* vol. 16 (3), pp. 119–120.

MARSHALL, B. A. 1981. The genus *Williamia* in the western Pacific (Mollusca: Siphonariidae). *New Zealand J. Zool.,* vol. 8, pp. 487–492, 2 figs.

MONTEROSATO, M. DE 1877. Notizie sulle conchiglie della rade di Civitavecchia. *Ann. Mus. Stor. nat. Genova,* vol. 9, pp. 407–428, 2 figs.

—— 1884. *Nomenclatura generica e specifica di alcune Conchiglie mediterranee,* 152 pp. Palermo.

MÖRCH, O. A. L. 1877a. Observations sur l'*Ancylus gussoni* Costa, et le nouveau sous-genre *Allerya. J. Conchyliol.,* vol. 25 (2), pp. 209–211.

—— 1877b. Synopsis molluscorum marinorum Indiarum occidentalium imprimis Insularum danicarum (contin.). *Malakol. Blätter,* vol. 24, pp. 93–123.

NEAVE, S. A. 1939. *Nomenclator zoologicus,* vol. 1, xiv+957 pp.
—— 1940. *Nomenclator zoologicus,* vol. 4, 758 pp.
REHDER, H. A. 1980. The marine mollusks of Easter Island (Isla de Pascua) and Sala y Gomez. *Smiths. Contrib. Zool.* vol. 289, iv+167 pp., 14 pls.
—— 1984. The genus *Brondelia* Bourguignat, 1862, and its taxonomic position. *Nautilus,* vol. 98 (2), pp. 83–84.
TOURNOUER, E. 1870. Sur des nummulites et une nouvelle espèce d'échinide trouvées dans le 'Miocène inférieur' ou 'Oligocène moyen' des environs de Paris. *Bull. Soc. géol. France* (2) vol. 26, pp. 974–982, 3 figs.
ZILCH, A. 1959–60. Gastropoda: Euthyneura in Schindewolf, ed., *Handbuch der Paläozoologie,* vol. 6 (2), pp. 1–400 (1959), 401–835+I–XII (1960).

TIBICINA AMYOT, 1847 AND *LYRISTES* HORVATH, 1926 (INSECTA, HEMIPTERA, HOMOPTERA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION BY THE SUPPRESSION OF *TIBICEN* BERTHOLD, 1827. Z.N.(S.)239

By R. V. Melville (*International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) and R. W. Sims (*British Museum (Natural History), London*)

The question of the status of *Tibicina* Amyot, 1847 and *Lyristes* Horváth, 1926 in relation to *Tibicen* Berthold, 1827 was first raised as an issue before the Commission by Dr R. G. Fennah in 1946 but was not then pursued. In 1961 he stated that he did not wish to pursue the case. In 1963 the problem surrounding the family–group names involved was raised separately (reference Z.N.(S.) 1626) by the late Dr China and his paper was published in April 1964 (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 21, pp. 154–160). The Commission voted on this application from March to June 1966, but though a two-thirds majority gave a favourable vote, Dr Holthuis pointed out that TIBICENIDAE [sic] Van Duzee, 1916 could not be suppressed unless the name of its type genus (*Tibicen*) was first suppressed; this would require a use of the plenary powers that had not been announced. No Opinion was accordingly then written.

2. In 1980 one of us (R.V.M.) noticed the connexion between the cases presented by Dr Fennah and Dr China and invited R.W.S. to coordinate them and canvass the views of hemipterists on the course of action best calculated to promote stability of nomenclature. The names principally involved are:

(a) *Cicada* Linnaeus, 1758, p. 434. The type species of this genus, by subsequent designation by Van Duzee, 1912, p. 491, is *Cicada tibicen* Linnaeus, 1758, p. 436. Until then, *Cicada plebeja* Scopoli, 1763 had been treated by most authors as the type species, following an invalid designation by Latreille, 1810. The confusion caused by Van Duzee's nomenclaturally valid action persists to this day.

(b) *Tibicen* Berthold, 1827, p. 424. The type species of this genus, by monotypy, is *Cicada plebeja* Scopoli, 1763, p. 117. In 1843 Amyot & Audinet–Serville stated wrongly that *Cicada haematodes* Scopoli, 1763 is the type species, and this was generally accepted because Latreille (from whose French vernacular of 1825 Berthold had taken *Tibicen*) included *C. haematodes* in *Tibicen* in 1829 but not *C. plebeja*. Moreover, the true *C. plebeja* has not the generic

characters given by Latreille (1825, 1829) and Berthold, 1827 to the genus.

(c) *Tibicina* Amyot, 1847, p. 154. Type species, by subsequent designation by Distant, July 1905, p. 22, *Cicada haematodes* Scopoli, 1763, p. 118. It was wrongly treated as a junior objective synonym of *Tibicen* by those who regarded *C. haematodes* as the type of both genera.

(d) *Lyristes* Horváth, 1926, p. 95. Type species, by original designation, *Cicada plebeja* Scopoli, 1763. Horváth accepted an invalid designation by Van Duzee, 1914, of *Cicada orni* Linnaeus, 1758, p. 436 as type species of *Cicada* Linnaeus, 1758, but believed that *C. haematodes* should be retained as type species of *Tibicen.* He proposed *Lyristes* for the genus typified by *C. plebeja,* left without a name.

(e) TIBICININAE Distant, 1905, p. 22 (type genus *Tibicina* Amyot, 1847.

(f) TIBICENINAE [sic; recte TIBICININAE] Van Duzee, 1916, p. 488 (type genus *Tibicen* Berthold, 1827).

(g) CICADINAE Berthold, 1827, p. 424 (as 'Cicadariae') (type genus *Cicada* Linnaeus, 1758).

3. China, 1964, sought principally to remove the confusion caused by the coexistence of TIBICININAE and TIBICENINAE. However, as Dr Holthuis has pointed out (in litt. 9 April 1981) the genitive of *Tibicen* is tibicinis, so that the family–group names are homonyms under Article 55a and the Commission must resolve this homonymy.

4. R.W.S. collected the facts about these names and outlined two alternative solutions to the problems. The first entailed the suppression under the plenary powers of *Tibicen* with the consequent invalidation of TIBICININAE Van Duzee, 1916; the replacement names would be *Lyristes* Horváth, 1926 and LYRISTINAE Gomez–Menor, 1957, pp. 28, 30. The second entailed the use of the plenary powers to designate *Cicada haematodes* Scopoli as type species of *Tibicen. Lyristes* would, as in the first alternative, become the valid name for the genus of which *Cicada plebeja* is the type species, and *Tibicina* would become a junior objective synonym of *Tibicen.* If this solution was adopted, the species hitherto included in *Tibicen* would pass into *Lyristes* and those included in *Tibicina* would pass into the revised concept of *Tibicen,* and confusion might then arise. These proposals were circulated to 16 specialists in CICADOIDEA;

M. Boulard, Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris
J. Dlabola, Narodni Muzeum, Prague
H. Duffels, Zoölogisch Museum, Universiteit, Amsterdam
J. S. Dugdale, DSIR Entomology Division, Auckland
W. della Giustina, Laboratoire de Zoologie du CNRS, Versailles
K. G. A. Hamilton, Biosystematics Research Institute, Ottawa
M. Hayashi, Saitami University, Urawa 338, Japan

F. Heller, Staatliches Museum für Naturkunde, Stuttgart
V. Kartal, Department of Zoology, University of Ankara
P. Lauterer, Jilova 33, Brno
Thomas E. Moore, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Kanya Naruse, Ichikawa-shi, Chiba–ken 272, Japan
J. Nast, Zoological Institute, ul. Wilcza 64, Warsaw
W. Scheld, Institut für Zoologie, Universität, Innsbruck.

5. The first responses to R.W.S's invitation consisted of 10 replies, of which six preferred to retain both *Tibicen* and *Tibicina,* with subfamilies TIBICENINAE (sic) and TIBICININAE. Four preferred the suppression of *Tibicen* and the rejection of TIBICENINAE, with the adoption of the replacement names *Lyristes* and LYRISTINAE. Among these replies that from M. Boulard examined the issues involved in great depth and is reproduced in full here. Although the text is not correct on every point of nomenclatural detail, it has not been edited from that point of view. It is hoped that our final proposals will be found to be correctly framed.

6. M. Boulard circulated his contribution to the specialists already named. As a result, three of the six who had voted to retain *Tibicen* now voted for its suppression. Two additional replies were received, one in favour of retaining *Tibicen,* the other its suppression. The final totals were thus four for the retention of *Tibicen* and eight for its suppression.

7. The replies showed some misunderstanding on two points:

(a) The status of *Tibicina* Amyot, 1847. This appeared in what was evidently an instalment of Amyot's *Entomologie française,* and that work began with an essay on the 'Méthode mononymique'. It was apparently the presence of that essay that led the Commission to reject the work in Opinion 686 (1963, *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 20, p. 423), but the ruling omitted to specify the instalment in which *Tibicina* appeared. The name is therefore available from Amyot, 1847 under Article 78e. If it were not available from that work, it would date from Kolenati, 1857, with implications for the method of fixation (but not for the identity) of the type species.

(b) the status of TIBICENINAE Van Duzee, 1916. Some of those who wished to see this name conserved overlooked the fact that, as the genitive of *Tibicen* is tibicinis, the name must be spelled TIBICININAE and is then a junior homonym of TIBICININAE Distant, 1905 (type genus *Tibicina* Amyot, 1847) and that this homonymy must be dealt with under Article 55a. Of those who understood that fact, some wanted PLATYPLEURINAE Schmidt, 1909 to be used in replacement, while others preferred LYRISTINAE Gomez Menor, 1957 (type genus *Lyristes* Horváth, 1926). It is clear

that there are taxonomic objections to the adoption of PLATYPLEURINAE.

8. M. Boulard's contribution now follows:

ARGUMENTS POUR LA SUPPRESSION DU NOM DE GENRE *TIBICEN* ET DE SES DÉRIVÉS DANS LA NOMENCLATURE DE LA SUPERFAMILLE DES CICADOIDEA

Par Michel Boulard (*Directeur-Adjoint du Laboratoire d'Entomologie de l'Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, Chef du Service des Homoptères du Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Secrétaire général de la Société Entomologique de France, 45, rue Buffon, F-75005 Paris*)

A. INTRODUCTION

1. En 1912 et 1914, la nomenclature et la classification supérieure alors en usage pour les 'CICADIDAE'[1] depuis plus d'un demi-siècle, furent bouleversées dans leurs éléments fondamentaux par Van Duzee. En dépit d'efforts répétés de la part de plusieurs auteurs, elles n'ont pas, aujourd'hui encore, retrouvé la stabilité statutaire aux niveaux des trois sous–familles principales.

2. Les trois sous–familles en question ont été fondées sur trois types de Cigales paléarctiques très connues et décrites à l'aube de la taxinomie entomologique dans le même genre *Cicada* Linné 1758: la Cigale de l'Orne, *C. orni* Linné, 1758; la Cigale plébéienne, *C. plebeja* Scopoli, 1763; et la Cigale rouge, *C. haematodes* Scopoli, 1763. Des différences, considérées comme essentielles et résidant chez les mâles, font que ces trois Cigales représentent trois taxa assez éloignés pour être chacun le taxon–type d'une sous–famille distincte.

3. Pendant plus de 100 ans, *Cicada* eut pour espèce–type *'C. plebeia'*. Mais *C. orni* ayant été finalement reconnue type du genre linnéen en 1914, les auteurs ne sont pas accordés, depuis, sur les statuts génériques des deux espèces scopoliennes: le même nom *Tibicen* étant donné:

(a) ou bien à *C. haematodes* [*Tibicen haematodes* (Scopoli, 1763), Amyot et Audinet–Serville, 1843] par les uns, qui nomment alors la Cigale plébéienne: *Lyristes plebeius* (Scop.) Horváth, 1926,

[1] *Cicadoidea: sensu* Metcalf, 1939 (*J. Soc. Bibliogr. Nat. Hist.*, vol. 1(9), p. 247) = *Cicadidae* Westwood, 1840 (*Intr. Mod. Class. Ins.*, vol. 2, p. [420]), Distant ... 1906 (*Syn. Cat. Hom.*, I) = *Cicadae verae* Latreille, 1802 (*Hist. Nat. génér. et partic. Crust. et Insec.*, vol. 3, p. 257); voir aussi note (10), *in fine*.

(b) ou bien à *C. plebeja* [*Tibicen plebeius* (Scopoli, 1763) Van Duzee, 1914] par les autres, qui appellent la Cigale rouge: *Tibicina haematodes* (Scop.) Kolénati, 1857.

4. Cette 'fixation oscillante' du taxon dénommé *Tibicen* qui, en raison de l'égale valeur systématique inhérente à l'une comme à l'autre espèce, se trouve dans les deux cas genre-type de deux sous-familles opposées, a entraîné et entraîne de graves désordres nuisant à la compréhension de la Superfamille. En outre, le cas (b), ci-dessus rappelé et mis en place par Van Duzee, conduisit à introduire dans la nomenclature des noms du groupe famille ayant même radical et ne diffèrant que par une seule lettre: Tibiceninae et Tibicininae, qui ajoutent à la confusion.

5. En 1964, avec le dessein de remédier à cet état catastrophique, China a établi une chronologie des évènements ayant noué le problème. Toutefois, cette chronologie souffre de lacunes importantes et les solutions alors proposées par China ne firent que reculer le problème sans le résoudre.

6. Afin d'aider à clarifier une situation aussi désastreuse qu'embrouillée, j'ai entrepris de recherches qui, conduites avec le souci de l'éthique et de la simplification rationnelle, m'ont amené à considérer que le mot *Tibicen* et ses dérivés ne devraient plus être maintenus dans la nomenclature en tant que noms de genre et de groupes. Ce point de vue, que j'ai déjà fait connaître très succintement en 1972, se trouve étayé en détail par les arguments que je développerai un peu plus loin, après avoir mis en évidence les sources du problème. La solution qui en découlera, permettrait, *mutatis mutandis,* d'écarter définitivement tous malentendus taxinomiques, d'étrangler, enfin, l'anarchie qui préside dans la systématique des Cigales.

B. LES SOURCES DU PROBLEME

I. Le choix de Latreille; prémisses de la classification

7. Nomenclature et classification des vraies Cigales reposèrent longtemps sur la désignation sans équivoque par Latreille de l'espèce *plebeia* comme type du genre *Cicada* (1810, *Considérations générales sur l'Ordre naturel ... des Insectes,* p. 434). Quoique venant après des citations d'autres espèces à la même place (*C. orni, in:* Lamarck, 1801, *Système des Animaux sans Vertèbres,* p. 292; *in:* Latreille, 1802, *Histoire naturelle ... des Insectes, Familles naturelles des genres, tome* 3ème, p. 257. *C. haematodes, in:* Latreille 1807, *Genera... insectorum,* p. [153]), cette désignation, faite dans un livre où le mot 'type' apparaissait pour la première fois avec son sens taxinomique, fut entérinée par les Homoptéristes du siècle passé et du début du siècle

présent, notamment: Amyot, Kolénati, Stål, Fieber, Puton, Mélichar, Kirkaldy, Goding, Froggatt, Oshanin et Distant.

8. Amyot, en 1847 (*Annls Soc. ent. Fr.* (2) 5, pp. 142–157[2]) établit, le premier, la distinction entre les trois Cigales, basée sur le critère cymbacalyptal[3]. Réservant le taxon *Cicada* à *plebeia* aux 'timbales entièrement recouvertes en dessus et latéralement' (*op. cit.*, p. 150), il crée alors *Tettigia* pour *orni* aux 'timbales plus ou moins laissées à découvert' (p. 152) et *Tibicina* pour *haematodes* aux 'timbales entièrement découvertes' (p. 152 et 154). Cette division tripartite, nettement fondée, qui fut reprise tout d'abord par Kolénati en 1857 (*Bull. Soc. Naturalist., Moscou,* vol. 30, pp. 399–429), deviendra celle distinguant les trois principales sous-familles et elle reste en vigueur aujourd'hui.

9. Distant, en 1906, rassemblant ses conceptions taxinomiques et systématiques sur les Cigales dans l'ouvrage fondamental que constitute son *'Synonymic Catalogue of... Cicadidae'* consacra cette division tripartite sous la forme retracée comme suit:

— Cicadinae, Distant, 1904, *Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist.* (7), vol. 14, p. 293, genre-type *Cicada* Linn. sensu Latreille, 1810, espèce-type *C. plebeja,* Scop. (p. 38).

— Gaeaninae, Dist., 1905, *Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist.* (7), vol. 15, p. 304 (p. 72), genre-type *Gaeana* Am. & Serv. 1843, espèce-type *G. maculata* Drury (p. 101); (sous-famille dans laquelle *Tettigia orni* L. se trouve citée la première, p. 74).

— Tibicininae, Dist., 1905, *Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist.* (7), vol. 16, p. 22, genre-type *Tibicina* Amyot, 1847, espèce-type *T. haematodes,* Scop. (p. 123).

II. Les choix de Van Duzee et de Horváth

10. Malheureusement, la désignation de Latreille ne put continuer d'être acceptée pour la raison primordiale, élevée en règle absolue lors du 5ème Congrès International de Zoologie (Berlin, 1901), que *C.*

[2]Ce travail est inclus dans un essai taxinomique intitulé: *'Entomologie française. Rhynchotes'*, avec, en sous-titre: *'Méthode mononymique'*, que parut tout d'abord en plusieurs parties de 1845 à 1847 (*in: Annls Soc. ent. Fr.*), puis en un seul volume (*Baillière* éd., *Paris,* 1848: 504 pp.). En 1963, la Commission (*Opinion* 686, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, vol. 20, p. 423) rejeta avec raison la méthode mononymique. Mais le texte d'invalidation ne mentionne pas la partie où sont traitées les Cigales et à l'en-tête de laquelle (p. 143) le sous-titre ne figure pas. Aussi, les taxa qui s'y trouvent inventés par Amyot restent-ils correctement établis. Je remercie mes collègues R. V. Melville et R. W. Sims (Londres) pour avoir attiré mon attention sur ce point important.

[3]de *cymbacalyptes*: plaques tergales recouvrant plus ou moins cymbales; protège-timbales, 'tymbal-covering'.

plebeja Scopoli ne figure pas parmi les espèces incluses par Linné en 1758 dans son genre *Cicada*. En 1912, Van Duzee (*Bull. Soc. nat. Sci. Buffalo*, vol. 10, p. 491), tenant compte de ce fait, a alors placé *Cicada tibicen* Linné, 1758 comme type du genre, et cette désignation est valide selon les règles en vigueur à l'époque, comme aussi selon celles du Code actuel. Pourtant deux ans plus tard Van Duzee (*Canad. Entomol.*, vol. 46, 1914, p. 387) crut bon de se corriger et il a désigné *Cicada orni* Linné, 1758 comme type du genre en se basant sur la citation unique de cette espèce par Lamarck en 1801 (*op. cit., loc. cit.*) après la diagnose que celui-ci donna pour le genre *Cicada* L.[4]

11. Van Duzee après avoir fixé, comme il le pensait, le genre *Cicada*, rechercha alors sous quel nom placer *plebeja*; il choisit 'TIBICEN' Latreille, 1825 et confirma, implicitement, la désignation de *C. haematodes* comme type de *Tibicina* Kolénati (*sic*, p. 388). Cela le conduisit à bouleverser la nomenclature alors acceptée pour les grandes divisions de la classification des Cicadoidea; celle–ci prit l'aspect calamiteux suivant, tiré des pages 22 et 23 du papier que Van Duzee fit paraître en 1915 (*J. New York entomol. Soc.*, vol. 23):

— TIBICINAE (*sic*) (=CICADINAE of Distant), genre *Tibicen* Latr., 1825 ... type *C. plebeja* Linn. (*sic*):

— CICADINAE (=GAEANINAE of Distant), sans indication d'espèce-type de *Cicada*, mais avec implication de *Cicada orni* L.

— TIBICIINAE (*sic*) (=TIBICINAE of Distant) (*sic*), sans indication d'espèce-type de *Tibicina*, mais avec implication de *Cicada haematodes* Scop.

12. Van Duzee (1916, *Check List of Hemipt.*, pp. 55 et 56; 1917, *Techn. Bull. Calif. agr. exp. Stat., Entomol.*, 2, pp. 488, 496, 498 et 500) maintint son choix (qui, à s'arrêter au seul plan formel, pourrait être vu comme correctement établi, cf. alinéas 18b et 22) et les noms de ses

[4]Je partage tout à fait l'opinion de M. Melville (*in litt.*) selon laquelle la désignation de *C. orni* par Van Duzee pourrait être invalidée: d'une part, elle est postérieure à celle de *C. tibicen* en 1912 et, d'autre part, la Commission, en 1924 (Opinion 79, *Smiths. misc. colls.*, vol. 73, pp. 15–16) a décidé que les citations d'espèces *in* Lamarck 1801 ne pouvaient pas être prises pour des désignations d'espèces-types. Il n'y a cependant aucun doute que *C. orni*, espèce citée dans la liste de Linné avant *C. tibicen* et de loin la plus anciennement connue, la première aussi et la seule à avoir été désignée tout d'abord comme l'"exemple' (au sens gestatoire manifeste de type) du genre par Latreille en 1802 (*Hist. nat. ... Insectes*, tome 3ème, p. 257), devrait être considérée, définitivement, espèce-type de *Cicada* L. dans l'intérêt de la stabilité de la nomenclature.

sous-familles, en leur apportant les amendements qui s'imposaient. Son schéma fut repris par Metcalf (1939, *J. Soc. Bibliogr. nat. Hist.*, vol. 1 (9), p. 248; 1963, *General Cat. Hom.*, VIII, *Cicadoidea*), bien qu'entre temps de nombreux auteurs, cicadologues[5] avertis pour la plupart, l'eussent soit refusé, soit ignoré ou laissé pour compte.

13. Le premier à s'être opposé explicitement au choix de Van Duzee fut Horváth, en 1926 (*Annls Mus. nat. Hung.* vol. 23, pp. 93–98). D'une part, cet auteur fit prendre conscience que Van Duzee se trouvait en désaccord total avec Latreille, l'inventeur du genre *Tibicen* et, d'autre part, il démontra le bien-fondé de la fixation du genre par Amyot et Audinet-Serville en 1843 (*Hist. nat. des Insectes Homopt.* p. 482), puis par Stål en 1861 (*Annls Soc. entomol. Fr.*, (4) 1, p. 617), lesquels avaient désigné *C. haematodes* Scop., mais il récusa l'usage de *Tibicina* pour cette espèce. Reconnaissant, toutefois, la fixation de *Cicada* L. par *C. orni*, Horváth fut alors amené à donner le nom *Lyristes* aux taxon générique ayant *C. plebeja* pour type.

14. Des actions de Van Duzee et de Horváth naquirent les deux courants antagonistes qui perturbent la nomenclature et la systématique supérieure des Cicadoidea: l'un préconisant *Tibicen haematodes* et *Lyristes plebeius*, l'autre tenant pour *Tibicen plebeius* et *Tibicina haematodes*. Ces deux courants charrient, entre autres épaves, deux noms du groupe famille de même radical, aboutissant aux sous-familles Tibiceninae et Tibicininae, variablement définies selon le choix générotypique, multipliant bévues et confusions, faisant des Cicadoidea un groupe incohérent.

III. Tibicen *et incohérences*

15. L'utilisation du mot *Tibicen*, perpétué pour l'une ou l'autre des grandes Cigales scopoliennes a conduit (et risque de conduire . . .) à placer dans un même taxon des espèces qui non seulement ne sont pas congénériques mais qui, en plus, n'appartiennent pas à la même famille. Il n'est que de se reporter aux catalogues pour relever avec Orian (1963, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (13), vol. 6, pp. 321–323) et China (1964, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, vol. 21(2), pp. 154–160) un nombre impressionnant d'erreurs résultant:

— soit de l'étroite similitude orthographique entre les deux patronymes et dans laquelle, d'ailleurs, Van Duzee s'empêtra le premier: Tibicinae Van Duzee 1915 (*loc. cit.*) = Tibiceninae Van Duzee 1917 (*loc. cit.*);

— soit de la désignation alternée de deux espèces pour la 'fixation' du taxon. Pour prendre de frappants exemples dans la faune européenne pourtant pauvre en Cigales, je rappel-

[5]J'admets, avec Amyot & Audinet-Serville, 1843, Blanchard, 1849, et pour des raisons à la fois d'homogénéité et d'euphonie une origine grecque pour *'Cicada'*.

lerai les non-sens tirés en 1972 (Boulard, *L'Entomologiste*, vol. 28 (6), p. 168) des catalogues de Metcalf (1963) et de Servadei (1967, Rhynchota, *Fauna d'Italia*, vol. IX, Bologna) où des espèces aussi éloignées que peuvent l'être *plebeja* Scopoli et *nigronervosa* Fieber voisinent dans le même genre *Tibicen*, tandis que des espèces très affines comme *haematodes* Scop. et *cisticola* Fairmaire sont placées dans des familles différentes. On peut de même citer Müller (1956, Cicadidae Latreille, *in: Sorauer, Handb. Pflanzenkrankh*, vol. V (3), p. 190) dans la revue duquel *Cicadetta* et *Platypedia* côtoient *Quesada, Lemuriana* et *'Tibicen haematodes'* dans une tribu dite des Tibicenini (*sic*, p. 191–192) pendant que *Mogania, Platypleura, Diceroprocta* et *Clidophleps* se retrouvent avec *'Cicada plebeja'* dans une tribu dite des *Cicadini* (*sic*, p. 195–198). On peut citer encore Ishihara (1961, *Cicadidae, Ins. Jap.* vol. 1 (2), 36 pp) pour qui le genre *'Tibicen* Latreille, 1825' à type *haematodes* Scopoli (*sic*) — espèce, rappelons le ici à nouveau, dépourvue de protège-timbales — renferme des espèces aux timbales entièrement cachées par des cymbacalyptes les plus développés qui soient! Etc. . . . D'autres exemples de la même veine peuvent se trouver dans la littérature un peu plus contemporaine. . . Aussi devient-il pressant de mettre un terme à cet état devagatoire.

C. DISCUSSION

16. La qualification fluctuante de *Tibicen* tend à montrer que ce terme ne fut pas, ou fut mal, défini à l'origine et que, de ce fait même, il fut et reste sujet à des interprétations divergentes. Effectivement, l'exégèse le révèle tour à tour *nomen nudum* et *nomen incertum*.

α) Tibicen, nomen nudum; création de *Lyristes*

I. Latreille dans le texte

17. Le mot Tibicen apparaît pour la première fois dans la littérature sous la plume de Latreille de la manière sibylline suivante: 'Les g. CIGALE, TIBICEN (*C. plebeia*)', sans plus mais après une courte diagnose s'appliquant à la première Tribu des Cicadaires, à la page 406 d'un livre dont il vaut la peine de remémorer le titre *in extenso*: 'Familles naturelles du Règne animal, exposées succintement et dans un ordre analytique avec l'indication de leurs genres' (Paris, 1825). Les genres mentionnés le sont en français et l'on doit à Berthold, auteur

d'une traduction allemande du livre de Latreille parue en 1827, d'avoir en même temps latinisé les noms génériques. Pour ce qui nous concerne ici, la transcription est la suivante, qu'il faut noter: 'Die Geschl. *Cicada, Tibicen* (*Cicada plebeia*). (*op. cit.*, p. 424).

18. En dehors de toute question de forme (cf. alinéa 21), il convient de faire remarquer dès maintenant que:

(a) Il y a *deux* noms de genre, normalement séparés, artifice d'écriture, par une virgule, pour *une* seule espèce citée;

(b) Le contexte montre que l'espèce citée s'y trouve tel qu'exemple général; de Cigales, de Tibicens et d'autres genres de 'Chanteuses', pressentis par Latreille. Ce sens propre de la citation se perçoit bien dans l'ensemble de l'ouvrage. Berthold, d'ailleurs, ne s'y est pas trompé qui prit soin d'écrire, en entier — seule altération apportée au texte original, peu remarquée mais de grande importance pourtant — le nom du genre de l'espèce citée: *Cicada plebeia* (*op. cit., loc. cit.*); ce qui permet de comprendre que, dans le texte latinisé, l'ambiguité est levée et que, du même coup, se trouvent confirmés: l'appartenance de l'espèce au premier genre nommé, la citation de celle-ci au titre de référence globale, la qualité *'nudum'* pour *Tibicen,* 1825. Enfin l'on apprendra, deux années plus tard, que Latreille pensait effectivement à un troisième genre: pour l'*orni* (cf. alinéa 19).

(c) L'espèce citée était, sans équivoque en 1825 (et en 1827, comme il vient d'être démontré) le type du premier genre nommé, ainsi que Latreille l'avait lui-même désignée en 1810, page 434 de sa 'Table des genres avec l'indication de l'espèce qui leur sert de Type' (*in: Considérations générales sur l'ordre ... des Insectes,* pp. 421–444). Bien qu'il soit évident aujourd'hui que Latreille, pour fixer *Cicada* L., n'aurait pas dû: ni revenir sur son choix de 1802, ni redésigner une espèce non incluse par Linné, il reste indubitable que, *jamais,* ce Pionnier de la Taxinomie n'a pensé à *C. plebeia* pour établir *Tibicen* en 1825.

19. Cela est si vrai qu'en 1829, Latreille (*in*: Cuvier, *Le Règne animal,* vol. 5, p. 215, note en bas de page) reconnaissant alors que *Tibicen* était *nomen nudum,* indiquera, en premier réviseur taxinomique, quelles Cigales composent ce genre: 'celles où le premier segment abdominal offre en dessus une entaille laissant à découvert la timbale, ... telles sont la *C. haematode* (*sic*) d'Olivier, les *T.* [pour *Tettigonia*] *picta, hyalina, algira,* de Fabricius, et son *T. orni,* qui pourrait, sous ce rapport, former un autre genre'. Que demander de plus à un texte de 1829 ? N'est-il clair que Latreille y confirmait ses intentions taxinomiques en préconisant le démembrement de son taxon *Cicada* en trois genres suivant un critère de distinction toujours aussi précieux de nos

jours: l'un, *Tibicen,* créé pour des espèces à timbales découvertes, un autre, non nommé mais réservé à l'*orni* dont on sait que ses timbales n'ont qu'un quart découvert, pendant que *Cicada* Latr. gardait *plebeja,* espèce non citée en 1829, et pour cause: ses timbales sont entièrement cachées. Ainsi, fondamentalement, *plebeja* ne peut être rangée dans le genre *Tibicen* et encore moins en être considérée comme le type. Dont acte.

II. Van Duzee dans le texte et ... le contexte

20. Pourtant, en 1914, Van Duzee crut devoir placer *plebeja* comme type de *Tibicen* Latr. 1825. S'arrêtant aux apparences et y croyant fort, Van Duzee allât jusqu'à écrire: 'Latreille in 1825 establishes (sic) genus *Tibicen* (sic) for (sic) *plebeja* Scop., ... Was *Tibicen* properly established (resic) by the simple naming of a well-known species in 1825 or must it be held over until 1829, when one distinguishing character (of no value) (sic[6]) was given and four species ... are named? Amyot and Serville take the latter view and name *haematodes* as its type. The genus can, however, be much more accurately recognised (sic) by the naming of *plebeja* in 1825 (resic), etc. (*loc. cit.,* pp. 387–388)'. *Non decet*! Ce texte, comparé avec ceux de Latreille remémorés plus haut, s'avère tissu d'affirmations non fondée. Et, comme tel, il n'est pas acceptable, car vouloir faire dire à un auteur ce qu'il n'a jamais pensé, ni *écrit,* ni laissé entendre, vouloir au surplus lui faire dire, comme c'est le cas ici, l'opposé de ses conceptions, est anti-scientifique et à proscrire. Il est temps de s'en apercevoir et je tiens à le souligner. Voilà pour le fond, voyons maintenant pour la forme.

21. Van Duzee, en 1914, fit paraître ses réformes au mépris:

(a) des Règles de la Nomenclature alors en usage, adoptées et amendées par les Congrès Internationaux de Zoologie de Paris 1889, Moscou 1892, Berlin 1901 et Berne 1904. Ces Règles stipulaient expressément, d'une part, que 'les noms génériques ... *doivent être latins ou latinisés*' — Ce n'est pas le cas dans le livre de Latreille publié en 1825 et seul pris en compte par Van Duzee — et, d'autre part, que: 'le nom attribué à chaque genre ... est le plus anciennement divulgué *à la condition que ce nom ait été clairement et suffisamment défini* ... ou ait été accompagné d'une indication' — ce n'est pas le cas pour la citation sibylline de Latreille, ni surtout pour la transcription précise de Berthold

[6]*Character of no value* ... que Van Duzee appréciera pourtant de tout premier plan par la suite, en 1915 et en 1917, particulièrement!

où (cf. alinéa 18b) *plebeia,* réaffirmée *Cicada,* ne peut être judicieusement considérée comme l'indication monotypique d'une espèce utilisable pour *Tibicen,*[7] qui reste *nomen nudum.* Par ailleurs et dès 1905, les Règles recommandaient d'éviter le choix de noms génériques qui ne diffèrent d'autres que *'par la désinence ou une légère variation orthographique'.* Aussi, même à considérer *Tibicen* comme établi, le simple bon sens eût voulu qu'à l'observation du tandem 'Tibiceninae–Tibicininae', on cherchât une autre solution et qu'on ne se bornât point, à n'importe quel prix, au choix d'une espèce citée seule après l'indication de deux genres, quand l'exégèse démontre que cette espèce: -en aucun cas, n'a été 'proposée' pour le second genre par son auteur (cf. alinéa 19) et -en tous cas, était connue et reconnue comme type du premier alors par tous (cf. alinéa 21b, ci-dessous).

(b) de la Commission internationale de Nomenclature zoologique qui, dans l'*Opinion* no. 11 rendue au moment du 8ème Congrès Int. de Zool. (Graz. 1910) avait validé la désignation des génotypes par Latreille 100 ans plus tôt. *Ipso facto,* en 1912, la fixation de *plebeja* comme type de *Cicada,* même hors les dispositions de l'Article 22 des 'Règles' de 1902, n'était plus contestable. Sauf, si cette fixation entrainait plus de confusion que de clarté — ce qui n'était pas le cas pour un usage consacré par un siècle.[8] Au surplus, une année avant la parution de ce *'Tibicen* for *plebeja'* aux funestes

[7]On peut faire remarquer que le principe de désignation par monotypie énoncé sans être nommé par Kirkaldy en 1900 (*The Entomologist,* vol. 31, p. 26), ne sera institué qu'avec les Règles qui parurent en 1907; il n'avait donc pas cours au moment du choix de Van Duzee.

[8]L'Opinion no. 11 ne fut remise en question qu'au 6ème Congrès International d'Entomologie, tenu à Madrid en 1935. De nouvelles dispositions y furent prises, qui justement rejetèrent les fixations de Latreille en 1810 lorsque l'espèce-type choisie n'était pas génériquement incluse à l'origine (*Op. rend. Int. comm. Zool. Nomencl.,* Opinion 136): c'est donc à partir de 1935 que l'article 22 devint applicable pour le cas étudié ici, en vertu du principe de rétroactivité.

conséquences, la Commission avait reçu les pleins pouvoirs, lors du 9ème Congrès Int. de Zool. (Monaco, 1913) pour, précisément, examiner et traiter ce genre de problèmes — ce que Van Duzee, à la place qu'il occupait alors, ne pouvait ignorer. On doit souligner en outre ici qu'en ce même Congrès, la décision fut prise d'admettre tout nom de genre en usage depuis 50 ans à la date de 1890 — ce qui était le cas parfait pour *Cicada* à type *plebeja*. La responsabilité de Van Duzee s'alourdit, le simple respect des Règles et des Institutions, un peu d'éthique aussi et le problème eût reçu un tout autre traitement... Mais le réformateur n'en tint pas compte; non plus en 1927 (*Pan-Pacif. Entomol.*, vol. 4, p. 47) où, dans une sorte de Bulle *urbi et orbi*, il s'estima au dessus des Règles internationales, soutenant: 'the case of Tibicen has nothing to do with these Rules' (*sic*).

(c) des taxinomistes et des systématiciens qui, tous et durant plus de 70 ans, avaient respecté les intentions taxinomiques de Latreille (1825, 1829) et singulièrement celle préconisant *Tibicen* pour *haematodes* puisque concrétisée par Amyot et Audinet-Serville (cf. alinéa 13). Ainsi donc, en 1914, la fixation de *Tibicen* par *haematodes* était taxinomiquement valide et elle l'est encore: indication essentielle de Latreille respectée, désignation de type par un réviseur notoire choisissant la première espèce citée par l'inventeur du genre. La désignation, postérieure, de *plebeja* pour *Tibicen* par Van Duzee est taxinomiquement invalide. Dont acte.

22. S'agissant de *Tibicen*, l'intervention, *motu proprio*, de Van Duzee donne donc, en fin d'analyse, un résultat aberrant, tout à la fois quant au fond et quant à la forme.

23. Horváth (1926, *Annls Mus. Nat. Hung.*, vol. 23, pp. 93–98), considérant, avec un soin scientifique scrupuleux, les écrits de Latreille ainsi que la nouvelle fixation du taxon *Cicada* (cf. alinéa 10), créa donc le genre *Lyristes* pour la Cigale plébéienne exclue de *Cicada* et pour laquelle aucun des taxa génériques connus ne convenait, à son avis. Cet avis était aussi celui de bien des auteurs, notamment de Handlirsch qui, en 1925 (*in:* Schröder, *Handb. der Entomol.* vol. 3, p. 1117), dans sa refonte des Sous-familles avec énumération des genres inclus, réexamina celle des Cicadinae Distant et y rangea *plebeja* Scop. en indiquant que cette dernière 'wird vielleicht mit *Rihana* Dist. zu vereinigen sein'! (*op. cit., loc. cit.*). Il convient de faire remarquer ici que, dans la classification de Handlirsch, *Tibicina* est présent mais non *Tibicen* et sa suite, les Tibiceninae étant alors rebaptisées 'Platypleurinae'. A l'encontre, Horváth maintint *Tibicen*, n'acceptant pas les tentatives qui avait abouti à remplacer ce mot dans l'une de ses acceptions par *Tibicina*.

β) *Tibicen*, nomen incertum; création de *Tibicina*

24. A la suite de la courte diagnose en note infrapaginale remémorée alinéa 19, Latreille n'a toutefois pas désigné de type pour *Tibicen*; il a donné les noms de quatre espèces qui, si elles ont effectivement les timbales à découvert (avec une restriction pour *hyalina*), présentent par ailleurs de telles différences (elles furent, par la suite, placées dans des genres distincts) que de *nomen nudum* en 1825, *Tibicen* devint *nomen incertum* en 1829. Et par voie de conséquence inapplicable. Deux rhynchologues de grand renom, en même temps qu'ils allaient distinguer taxinomiquement *Cicada plebeja, C. orni* et *C. haematodes* au niveau du groupe genre, allaient laisser pour compte; et le mot *Tibicen*, de définition incertaine, et son attribution spécifique, aléatoire.

25. En 1847, Amyot (*Annls Soc. entomol. Fr.* (2), vol. 5, pp. 143–157) a séparé les trois Cigales suivant le critère évoqué par Latreille en les plaçant respectivement (cf. alinéa 8) dans les taxa: '*Cicada* Réaum. — Linn. — Geoffr.' (p. 149), *Tettigia* nov. (p. 152) et *Tibicina* nov. (p. 154). Dix années plus tard, Kolénati (*Bull. Soc. Nat. Moscou, sect. Biol.*, vol. 30, pp. 400, 404 et 415) dota formellement les taxa précédents de leur étiquette linnéenne en leur attribuant le rang de sous-genre, ratifiant ainsi les désignations d'espèces par Amyot comme leurs types respectifs.

26. En raison de la limpidité de ces nouvelles dispositions, la plupart des taxinomistes et des systématiciens, non seulement les adoptèrent, mais les adaptèrent. Notamment Fieber, qui fit de *Tibicina* un genre à part entière (1872, *Katalog europ. Cicad.*, p. 1; 1876, *Les Cicadines d'Europe*, p. 20) et Distant, pour qui ce genre était le taxon-type de la sous-famille des Tibicininae (1905, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (7), vol. 15, p. 304; 1906, *Syn. Cat. Hom.* I. *Cicad.*, p. 107). L'un et l'autre attribuèrent la paternité du taxon *Tibicina* au seul Amyot, ce qui reste valide aujourd'hui.

27. Mais vinrent Van Duzee et sa réforme, et le pernicieux embrouillamini qui en résulta, dans lequel nous sommes empêtrés et dont, enfin, il faut se sortir.

γ) La double proposition de China

28. En 1964, China (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* vol. 21, pp. 154–160), donnant suite aux remarques faites, un an plutôt, par Orian (*Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (13) vol. 6, 1963, pp. 321–323) lors de la parution du Catalogue de Metcalf consacré aux Cigales, proposa:

(a) la suppression du nom de groupe Tibiceninae, comme cela fut suggéré par Orian (op. cit., p. 323) et son remplacement par Platypleurinae, Handlirsch, 1925, genre-type *Platypleura* Am. & Serv., Schmidt, 1919 (*Stett. Ent. Zeitg.*, vol. 79, p. 378, *Platypleurini*).

(b) le maintien de *Tibicen* à type *plebeja*.

29. Le premier volet de cette double proposition, représentant en quelque sorte un progrès, fut admis par la plupart des auteurs contemporains dont moi–même, mais le second le fut beaucoup moins, car non cohérent avec le premier. Cependant, attentivement examinée, la proposition de China s'avère non convenable dans son ensemble.

30. Elle est d'abord mal fondée pour le changement du nom de sous–famille: on sait que chaque taxon du groupe famille se trouve défini par référence à son genre-type et que ce dernier l'est par l'espèce–type. Dans le cas qui nous préoccupe, c'est *C. plebeja* Scopoli qui, par ses caractères propres et l'ancienneté de sa description, détermine le taxon générique sur lequel repose le nom de groupe qui lui est lié; si le nom de genre appliqué ne convient pas, il doit être changé mais *non l'espèce* caractérisant le taxon. Le changement proposé par China (comme par Handlirsch) est illégitime et, comme tel, inacceptable.

31. D'autre part, en maintenant *Tibicen* à type *plebeja,* China non seulement s'inscrivit en faux vis-à-vis de Latreille (en omettant de mentionner les travaux de celui–ci parus en 1825 et 1829), mais:

(a) il ne tint pas compte de la fixation régulière effectuée par Amyot & Audinet–Serville en 1843 (*Tibicen haematodes,* cf. alinéa 21c) que, d'ailleurs, il oublia également de citer;

(b) il ne fit que reculer d'un cran, de la sous-famille à la tribu,[9] l'épineuse question linguistique, déjà évoquée notamment par Jacobi en 1907 (*Abhandl. u. Ber. k. Zool. u. Anthrop.-Ethnog. Mus. Dresden,* vol. 11, p. 14, note infrapaginale) et par Kato, en 1956 (*Biol. of Cicadas,* p. 65).

32. Rien n'est alors résolu; au contraire, une complication supplémentaire est apparue avec le remplacement de Tibiceninae par Platypleurinae...

[9]L'espèce *plebeja* ne peut être placée dans la tribu des *Platypleurini*; elle caractérise une tribu qui lui est propre et tour à tour appelée: *Cicadini* Distant, 1904, p. 329; *Tibicenini* Van Duzee, 1916, p. 55; *Lyristarini* Gomez-Menor, 1957, p. 28; *Lyristini* Boulard, 1972, p. 169.

D. SOLUTION ET CONCLUSION

33. Par tout ce qui précède, il appert que l'utilisation du mot *Tibicen* mal défini à l'origine, de fixation ambiguë et, par suite, diversement interprété, est la cause de graves désordres dans la superfamille des Cicadoidea. J'ai démontré l'incongruité de la réforme de Van Duzee en 1914 et remis en évidence que l'acception taxinomiquement fondée pour *Tibicen* est celle fixée par Amyot & Audinet-Serville en 1843. Toutefois, conserver ce terme risque, au point où nous en sommes, de perpétuer le chassé-croisé des espèces, de multiplier les bévues et les méprises, de s'opposer au progrès scientifique et, par conséquent d'être nuisible, au sens actuel des Règles.

34. Aussi suis-je amené à préconiser la SUPPRESSION TOTALE de l'usage du nom de genre *Tibicen*, ainsi que des noms de groupes qui en sont dérivés (Tibicenini, Tibiceninae et Tibicenidae) et la Commission est priée d'user de ses pleins pouvoirs à cet effet.

35. Cette suppression, si elle est acceptée et ratifiée, aurait pour effet de clarifier définitivement la nomenclature fondamentale des Cicadoidea et d'éliminer tous malentendus à ce niveau, de permettre enfin une bonne compréhension de la superfamille. Elle ne causerait pas de perturbation outre mesure par les rectifications conséquentes (en fait: le remplacement de *Tibicen* par *Lyristes* dans le catalogue mondial de Metcalf) qui auraient l'avantage d'être radicales; certaines déjà ont été apportées (cf. Haupt, 1935, *Die Tierw. Mitteleur.* vol. 4, p. 150; Matsumura, 1939, *Ins. Mats.*, vol. 13, pp. 47–51; Gomez Menor Ortega, 1957, *Monografía de Cicádidos* (*Homoptera*) *de España*, pp. 1–88).

36. Partant de cette suppression, les dénominations les plus anciennes, convenablement définies à l'origine des taxa génériques servant de bases dans l'établissement de la classification supérieure des Cicadoidea seront les suivantes, accompagnées du nom des espèces-types puis de celui des sous-familles caractérisées:

(a) *Cicada* (Linné, 1758) Van Duzee 1912, espèce-type: *Cicada orni* L., 1758, Van Duzee 1914; genre-type des CICADINAE (Horváth, 1911) Van Duzee 1915 [=Gaeaninae Distant 1905, 1906].

(b) *Tibicina* (Amyot, 1847) Kolénati, 1857, espèce-type: *C. haematodes* Scopoli, 1763 (Amyot, 1847); genre-type des TIBICININAE Distant, 1905, 1906 [=Tibiceninae Dist., 1889; =Tibiciniinae Van Duzee 1915].

(c) *Lyristes* Horváth 1926, espèce-type: *C. plebeja* Scopoli, 1763, Horváth, 1926; genre-type des LYRISTINAE (Gomez-Menor Ortega; 1957) [=Cicadinae Distant, 1899, 1906; = Tibicinae Van Duzee, 1915; =Tibiceninae Van Duzee, 1917, Metcalf, 1963; =Platypleurinae Handlirsch, 1925, China, 1964].

37. Ayant changé ce qui devait être changé, nous obtiendrons le tableau simple suivant des principales sous-familles de Cicadoidea ou *Cicadae verae*[10]:

Taxa / espèces-types	Genres	Tribus	Sous-familles	Familles
orni Linné, 1758	*Cicada* Linné, 1758	Cicadini Van Duzee, 1915	Cicadinae Van Duzee, 1915	Cicadidae Van Duzee, 1915
plebeja Scopoli, 1763	*Lyristes* Horváth, 1926	Lyristini Gomez-Menor, 1957	Lyristinae Gomez-Menor 1957	
haematodes Scopoli, 1763	*Tibicina* Amyot, 1847	Tibicinini Distant, 1905	Tibicininae Distant, 1905	Tibicinidae Distant, 1905

CONCLUSION: TWO ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

9. There would appear to be two alternative solutions to the problem so thoroughly analysed by M. Boulard. One would entail the suppression of *Tibicen*; M. Boulard argues strongly for this course, and it is the one preferred by eight of the specialists listed in para 4 above. The other would entail a ruling that the stem of *Tibicen,* for the purposes of Article 29, is TIBICEN-. (Either solution would require the use of

[10]Je crois bon de souligner à nouveau que la superfamille des Cicadoidea ne renferme plus aujourd'hui que les vraies Cigales ou *Cicadae verae* de Latreille. Certains auteurs utilisent encore Cicadoidea avec l'acception ancienne de *Cicadariae* Latreille, 1802 ou Cicadaires et qui correspond à la section des Homoptères *Auchenorhyncha* (Duméril, 1806). Cette dualité cause quelques embarras, particulièrement au niveau de la bibliographie, autre problème... La notation correcte est: *Cicadoidea* (Latreille, 1802) Metcalf, 1939.

the plenary powers.) However, the presence of two tribe names and two subfamily names with the stems TIBICEN — and TIBICIN — respectively in the same superfamily is an undeniable source of confusion.

10. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked, first, to vote for or against the use of the plenary powers in the present case and then to vote for one or other of the following alternatives:

ALTERNATIVE A

(1) to use the plenary powers
  (a) to suppress the generic name *Tibicen* Berthold, 1827 for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;
  (b) to set aside all designations of type species hitherto made for the genus *Cicada* Linnaeus, 1758, and to designate *Cicada orni* Linnaeus, 1758 as type species of that genus;
(2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;
  (a) *Cicada* Linnaeus, 1758 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above, *Cicada orni* Linnaeus, 1758;
  (b) *Tibicina* Amyot, 1847 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Distant, July 1905., *Cicada haematodes* Scopoli, 1763;
  (c) *Lyristes* Horváth, 1926 (gender: masculine), type species, by original designation, *Ciada plebeja,* Scopoli, 1763;
(3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;
  (a) *orni* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Cicada orni* (specific name of type species of *Cicada* Linnaeus, 1758);
  (b) *haematodes* Scopoli, 1763, as published in the binomen *Cicada haematodes* (specific name of type species of *Tibicina* Amyot, 1847);
  (c) *plebeja* Scopoli, 1763, as published in the binomen *Cicada plebeja* (specific name of type species of *Lyristes* Horváth, 1926);
(4) to place on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology:
  (a) CICADIDAE Berthold, 1827 (as 'Cicadariae') (type genus *Cicada* Linnaeus, 1758);
  (b) TIBICININAE Distant, 1905 (type genus *Tibicina* Amyot, 1847);
  (c) LYRISTINAE Gomez-Menor, 1957 (type genus *Lyristes* Horváth, 1926);

(5) to place the generic name *Tibicen* Berthold, 1827, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (a) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.

ALTERNATIVE B

(1) to use the plenary powers
  (a) to rule that the stem of the generic name *Tibicen* Berthold, 1827, for the purposes of Article 29, is TIBICEN-;
  (b) as (1) (b) in Alternative A;
(2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:
  (a) and (b) as in Alternative A;
  (c) *Tibicen* Berthold, 1827, (gender: masculine), type species, by monotypy, *Cicada plebeja* Scopoli, 1763;
(3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
  (a) and (b) as in Alternative A;
  (c) *plebeja* Scopoli, 1763, as published in the binomen *Cicada plebeja* (specific name of type species of *Tibicen* Berthold, 1827);
(4) to place on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology:
  (a) and (b) as in Alternative A;
  (c) TIBICENINAE Van Duzee, 1916 as nomenclaturally validated under the plenary powers in (1) (a) above (type genus *Tibicen* Berthold, 1827).

REFERENCES

AMYOT, C. J. B. 1845. Entomologie française. Rhynchotes. Méthode mononymique. Préface. *Ann. Soc. entomol. France* (2), vol. 3, pp. 369–385.

—— 1847. Ibid., Ordre deuxième, Homoptères. Homoptera. Latr. *Ibid.*, (2), vol. 5, pp. 143–238.

—— & AUDINET-SERVILLE, J. G.1843. Homoptères. Homoptera Latr. *Hist. nat. Ins. Hémipt.*, p. 455–648.

BOULARD, M. 1972. Les positions génériques réelles des Cigales françaises et leur classification. *L'Entomol.*, vol. 38 (6), pp. 167–171.

—— 1976. Un type nouveau d'appareil stridulant accessoire pour les Cicadoidea; révision de la classification supérieure de la superfamille. *J. nat. Hist.* 1976, (10), pp. 399–407.

BERGROTH, E. 1913. Bibliographisches über Hemipteren.- *Entomol. Mitt.* vol. 2, pp. 10–12.

CHINA, W. E. 1964. Tibicinidae VAN DUZEE, 1916 (Insecta Cicadoidea) proposed suppression under the plenary powers in favour of Platypleuridae SCHMIDT, 1918, Z.N.(S.) 1626. *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, vol. 21 (2), p. 154–160.

CHINA, W. E. et FENNAH, R. G. 1945. On the Genera *Tetigonia* Geoff., *Tettigonia* F., *Tettigoniella* Jac., and *Iassus* Fab. (Hemiptera-Homoptera). *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (11) 12, pp. 707–712.

C.I.N.Z. 1914. The designation of genotypes by Latreille, 1810. Opinion 11 *in:* Règles int. Nom. Zool., *IX Cong. int. Zool. Monaco*, 1913, p. 911.

C.I.N.Z. 1924. Opinion 79. Case of Lamarck's (1801A) Système des Animaux sans vertèbres. *Smith. misc. coll.*, vol. 73 (2), pp. 15–16.

C.I.N.Z. 1963. Opinion 686: Amyot, méthode mononymique: placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoological Nomenclature. *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* vol. 20 (6), p. 423

DISTANT, W. L. 1889. *A Monograph of Oriental Cicadidae.* Parts 1 and 2. 48 pp.

—— 1904. Rhynchotal notes. XXVII. *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (7) vol. 14, pp. 329–336.

—— 1905. Rhynchotal notes. XXX. *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (7), vol. 15, pp. 304–319.

—— 1906. *A synonymic catalogue of Homoptera.* Part 1. Cicadidae. 207 pp.

DUPUIS, C. 1965. Notions essentielles en nomenclature zoologique et botanique. *Cahiers des Nat., Bull. N.P.* (n.s.) vol. 21 (1), pp. 1–11.

GOMEZ MENOR ORTEGA, J. 1957. Monografía de Cicadidos (Homoptera) de España. *Mem. r. Acad. Cienc. Madrid* (Cienc. nat.) vol. 19, 88 pp.

HANDLIRSCH, A. 1925. Überfamilie: Stridulantes Latr. (Singzikaden) *in:* Schröder, *Hand. d. Entomol.*, vol. III, p. 1115–1117.

HAUPT, H. 1935. Homoptera. *Die Tierwelt Mitteleuropas*, vol. 4 (3), pp. 115–221.

HERRMANNSEN, A. N. 1852. *Indicis Generum Malacozoorum Supplementa et Corrigenda.*

HORVATH, G. 1911. Nomenclature des familles des Hémiptères. *Ann. Hist. nat. Mus. Hung.*, vol. 9, pp. 1–34.

—— 1926. Les noms génériques de nos trois grandes Cigales indigènes. *Ibid.*, vol. 23, pp. 93–98.

ISHIHARA, T. 1961. Hemiptera: Cicadidae. *Insecta japonica*, ser. 1, part 2, 36 pp.

KATO, M. 1932. *Monograph of Cicadidae.* 332 pp. 32 pls (en japonais). 1954. The classification of Cicadidae. *Kontyû* vol. 21 (3–4), pp. 971–999, en japonais.

—— 1956. The biology of the Cicadas. *Bull. Cicad. Mus., Iw.* shoten publ. Tokyo. 319 p. (en japonais, sous-titré en anglais).

—— 1961. Cicadidae (Insecta). *Fauna japonica*; Biogeo. Soc. Jap. publ., 72 pp., 34 pl.

KIRKALDY, G. W. 1900. On the nomenclature of the genera of the Rhynchota, Heteroptera and Auchenorhynchous Homoptera. *The Entomol.*, vol. 33, pp. 262–265.

—— 1908. Bibliographical and nomenclatorial notes on the Hemiptera, no 8. *Ibid.*, vol. 41, pp. 123–124.

LAMARCK, J. B. 1801. Insectes Hémiptères. *in: Système des Animaux sans vertèbres.* 432 pp.

LATREILLE, P. A. 1810. Table des genres avec l'indication des espèces qui leur servent de type. *in: Considérations générales sur l'Ordre naturel des Animaux composant les Classes des Crustacés, des Arachnides et des Insectes*, pp. 421–444.

—— 1825. Homoptères. Homoptera. *in: Familles naturelles du Règne Animal*, 570 pp.
—— 1827. *Ibid.*, traduction allemande de BERTHOLD, A., augmentée de remarques et de suppléments.
—— 1829. Hémiptères. Homoptères (Homoptera). *in:* CUVIER, *Règne Animal*, 5, pp. I–XXIV, 1–556.
LINNE, C. 1758. Hemiptera. *in: Systema Naturae.* Editio decima, reformata. 824 pp.
MATSUMURA, S. 1939. On the Genus Lyristes Horvath and two new species of Cicadidae. *Ins. Mats.*, vol. 13 (2–3) pp. 47–51.
MELICHAR, L. 1896. *Cicadinen (Hemiptera-Homoptera) von Mittel-Europa*, 381 pp.
MEQUIGNON, A. 1932. Latreille et le Génotype. *Soc. entomol. France*, Livre du centenaire, pp. 149–156.
METCALF, Z. P. 1939. Hints on bibliographies. *J. soc. Bibl. nat. Hist.* vol. 1 (9), pp. 241–248 (p. 241: fam. et sous-fam. des Auchénorhynques).
—— 1963. Cicadoidea. *General Catalogue of the Homoptera*, vol. VIII.
MULLER, H. J. 1956. Cicadidae Latreille, Stridulantia, Singzirpen, Cicadas. *in:* Sorauer, *Handb. Pflanzenkrankh.*, vol. V (3), pp. 190–199.
MYERS, J. G. 1928. Cicadidae. *Insects of Samoa and other Samoan terrestrial Arthropoda*, vol. 2 (2), pp. 55–65.
—— 1929. Insect Singers. *A Natural History of the Cicadidae*, G. Routledge ed. London: 324 pp.
OLIVIER, G. A. 1790. Cigale, Cicada. *Encyclop. méth. hist. nat. Ins.*, vol. 5, pp. 735–760.
ORIAN, A. J. E. 1963. A new genus of Cicadidae (Homoptera) from the Island of Rodriguez with notes on nomenclature of the family. *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.*, (13) vol. 6, pp. 321–328.
OSHANIN, V. P. 1912. *Katalog der Paläarktischen Hemipteren*, pp. I–XVI, 1–187.
POCHE, F. 1908. Supplement zu C. O. Waterhouses Index Zoologicus. *Zool. Anzeiger*, vol. 2, pp. 273–343.
—— 1909. Über die angeblich von Latreille in seinen 'Familles Naturelles du Règne Animal' eingeführten Gattungsnamen. *Deutsche entomol. Zeitschr.* 1909, pp. 413–414.
—— 1913. Uber die Zeit der Einführung der Namen der von Latreille in seinen 'Familles naturelles du Règne Animal' neu unterschiedenen Gattungen. *Entomol. Mitt.* vol. 2, 1913, pp. 144–145.
—— 1933. Uber den nomenklatorischen Status der Gattungsnamen in Latreilles 'Familles Naturelles du Règne Animal' im allgemeinen und über den giltigen Gattungsnamen für *Cicada plebeja* Scop. im besonderen. *Konowia*, vol. 12, pp. 326–331.
PUTON, A. 1875. *Catalogue des Hémiptères (Hétéroptères, Cicadines et Psyllides) d'Europe et du bassin de la Méditerranée.*
—— 1886. *Catalogue des Hémiptères (Hétéroptères, Cicadines et Psyllides) de la faune paléarctique.* 100 pp.
—— 1899. *Ibid.* 121 pp.
SCHEDL, W. 1973. Zur Verbreitung, Bionomie und Okologie der Singzikaden. Homoptera: Auchenorrhyncha, Cicadidae) der Ostalpen und ihrer benachbarten Gebeite. *Ber. nat.-med. Ver. Innsbruck* vol. 60, pp. 79–94.

SCHMIDT, E. 1918. Platypleura frontalis, ein neue Singzikade von Sumatra. (Rhynchota-Homoptera). *Stettin. entomol. Zeitg.* vol. 79, p. 378.

—— 1919. Beiträge zur kenntnis ansereuropäischer Zikaden. (Rhynchota-Homoptera) I. Ugada Hahnei, eine neue Singzikade von Kamerun. *Ibid.* vol. 80, pp. 365–368.

SCOPOLI, J. A. 1763. *Entomologia carniolica*, pp. 112–118.

SERVADEI, A. 1967. Rhynchota (Heteroptera, Homoptera, Auchenorrhyncha). Catalogo topografico e sinonimico. *Fauna d'Italia*, vol. IX, ed. Calderini, Bologna.

STAL, C. 1861. Genera nonnulla nova Cicadinorum. *Ann. Soc. entomol. France* (4) vol. 1, pp. 613–622.

VAN DUZEE, E. P. 1912. Hemipterological gleanings. *Bull. Buffalo Soc. nat. Sci.* vol. 10 (2), pp. 477–512.

—— 1914. Nomenclatural and critical notes on Hemiptera. *Canad. entomol.*, vol. 46, pp. 387–388.

—— 1915. A preliminary review of the West Coast Cicadidae. *J. N.Y. entomol. Soc.*, vol. 23, pp. 21–44.

—— 1916. Suborder Homoptera Latr. 1810. Section Auchenorrhyncha A. S. 1843. *Check list of Hemiptera (excepting the Aphidae, Coccidae, and Aleurodidae) of America, North of Mexico*, pp. 55–85.

—— 1927. On the Standing of the genus Tibicen Latr. *Pan-Pacific Entomol.*, vol. 11, p. 47.

RANA MACULATA BROCCHI, 1877 AND *ELEUTHERODACTYLUS RICHMONDI* STEJNEGER, 1904 (AMPHIBIA, SALIENTIA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION. Z.N.(S.)1750

Report by the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

In 1966 (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 23, pp. 169–173) Smith, Lynch & Reese applied for the suppression of *Rana maculata* Daudin, 1801 for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and those of the Law of Homonymy. Their object was to conserve the junior homonym *Rana maculata* Brocchi, 1877 and the junior synonym *Eleutherodactylus richmondi* Stejneger, 1904. They stated that *Rana maculata* Daudin was a nomen dubium that had not then been used as a valid name for 150 years.

2. No comment was received on that application, which was sent for a vote between 12 June and 12 September 1968. Although the 20 affirmative votes received easily justified the plenary powers action requested, the one negative vote (from Dr Sabrosky) caused me to cancel that voting paper with a view to publishing Dr Sabrosky's objection and the applicants' reply. The former was published in 1969 (vol. 26, pp. 119–120) and the latter in 1970 (vol. 27, pp. 66–67). Further objection to the proposal from the nomenclature committee of the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists was received from the late Dr James A. Peters, who, speaking for himself, thought that no application to the Commission ought ever to have been made. The main points at issue are set out in greater detail below.

POINTS FROM THE ORIGINAL APPLICATION

3. The applicants showed that Daudin's type specimen was missing from a comparatively early date, since no mention is made of it by Duméril & Bibron, 1841, and they apparently could not find it, and Guibé, 1950, does not mention it. Neither the species nor the specimen on which it was based is mentioned in any of the major synopses of anurans.

4. In 1877 Brocchi described both *Rana maculata* (a new species, distinct from Daudin's) and *R. macroglossa*. Smith, 1959, pp. 212–216, synonymised the two names and (p. 214), acting as first reviser, chose *R. maculata* as the valid name. Stuart, 1963, p. 45, rejected Smith's first reviser action on the grounds that his paper was not 'revisionary' and used *R. macroglossa* as the valid name. The applicants then proceeded to designate lectotypes for the two nominal species in such a way as to make *R. macroglossa* a junior synonym of *R. pipiens* Schreber, 1782, thus removing it from consideration in connexion with their application.

They pointed out that if *R. maculata* Brocchi was allowed to fall as a junior homonym, the valid name for the species would be *R. melanosoma* Günther, 1900, a name never used as valid since its establishment. They then asked, as mentioned above, for the suppression of *R. maculata* Daudin, 1801; but they did not ask for either *R. maculata* Brocchi, 1877, or *Eleutherodactylus richmondi* Stejneger, 1904 to be placed on the Official List because 'their specific relationship to adjacent taxa remains to be determined with finality'.

DR SABROSKY'S COMMENTS

5. Dr Sabrosky started by pointing out that several possible solutions to the applicants' problem existed and that the Commission should have been presented with a choice between them. He set out four:

A. Application of the Code, without use of the plenary powers or Article 23b [then in force]. Result: *E. richmondi* would fall as a synonym of *E. maculatus* (Daudin); *R. maculata* Brocchi would fall as a junior homonym and be replaced by *R. melanosoma* Günther, 1900;

B. Application of the Code and use of Article 23b. Result, *R. maculata* Daudin would fall as a nomen oblitum and *E. richmondi* would stand; *R. maculata* Brocchi would be replaced by *R. melanosoma* as under A.

C. The original proposal. Result: *R. maculata* Daudin is suppressed; *E. richmondi* becomes nomenclaturally valid; *R. maculata* Brocchi becomes nomenclaturally valid through the suppression of its senior homonym and because the lectotype selection has sunk *R. macroglossa* as a junior synonym of *R. pipiens.*

D. Dr Sabrosky's proposal: Suppression of *R. maculata* for priority but not for homonymy and suppression of the proposers' lectotype designation of lectotype for *R. macroglossa,* followed by designation of the Paris Museum lectotype (or a paralectotype) of *R. maculata* Brocchi as lectotype of *R. macroglossa.* Result: *E. richmondi* becomes nomenclaturally valid as the applicants desired. *R. macroglossa* becomes valid over *R. maculata* Brocchi (whose status as a junior homonym is not altered) in accordance with 'fairly well entrenched usage' according to Stuart, 1963.

6. Dr Sabrosky pointed out that the applicants' designation of a lectotype for *macroglossa* altered the usage of that name between 1941 and 1959, thereby generating confusion that had not existed before. He recommended Alternative D because it would preserve that part of the applicants' aims that concerned synonymy (conservation of *E. richmondi* — though no supporting evidence of the desirability of that

step had been provided) but not that which concerned homonymy. He added that the applicants by their lectotype designation had closed certain options to the Commission that ought to have been left open to it. By that action they had created a disadvantage to the preservation of a previously stable nomenclature.

7. Dr Peters, on behalf of the nomenclature committee of the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists, gave the names of six herpetologists who supported Sabrosky's Alternative D and one who supported Alternative A. He reported that two of the original applicants stuck to their original position. Smith and Lynch, in rebutting Sabrosky's case (see below), said that *R. maculata* Brocchi had been used twice before 1959 and about half a dozen times since [up to 1970] and that *R. macroglossa* had not been used at all before 1959 and about 20 times since [up to 1970]. In his view, action within the limits imposed by the Code could and should have been taken, in which case no application to the Commission would have been necessary. In the circumstances of 1970, however, he supported Sabrosky's Alternative D.

REPLY BY DR SMITH AND DR LYNCH TO DR SABROSKY

8. Dr Smith and Dr Lynch strongly supported their original decisions. In view of the small amount of usage of *R. macroglossa* they did not regard stability of nomenclature as an important factor in the choice between that name and the simultaneously published *R. maculata* Brocchi. They attached weight to two other factors: (1) the precise type locality of *R. maculata* Brocchi vis-à-vis the vague one of *R. macroglossa*; and (2) the taxonomic unity among the syntypes of *R. maculata* Brocchi vis-à-vis the taxonomic mixture among the syntypes of *R. macroglossa,* thus making the application of the former unambiguous compared to that of the latter. They denied that *R. macroglossa* could be said to be well entrenched in usage.

9. In 1979 Dr Lynch sent me, at my request, particulars of eight uses of the disputed names since 1970. These were:

1971. Meyer, J. R. & Wilson, L. D. *Contrib. Sci. Los Angeles County Mus.*, no. 218, p. 31 (*R. macroglossa*)
1972. Villa, J. *Anfibios de Nicaragua,* pp. 74–77 (*R. maculata* Brocchi)
1972. Wilson & Meyer. *Herpetol. Rev.*, vol. 4, p. 219, review of Villa (*R. maculata* Brocchi with *R. macroglossa* as a junior synonym)
1974. Greding, E. J., Jr. *J. Herpetol.*, vol. 8, p. 189 (*R. macroglossa*)
1975. Henderson, R. W. & Hoevers, L. G. *Contrib. Biol. Geol. Milwaukee pub. Mus.*, no. 5, p. 17 (*R. maculata* Brocchi)
1976. Lee, J. C. *Herpetologica* vol. 32, pp. 211–214 (*Rana maculata* Brocchi with *R. macroglossa* as junior synonym)

1977. Webb, R. G. & Korky, J. K. *Herpetologica*, vol. 33, pp. 73–82 (*R. maculata* Brocchi with *R. macroglossa* as junior synonym)

1978. Webb, R. G. *Contrib. Sci. Los Angeles County Mus.*, no. 300, pp. 10–12 (*R. maculata* Brocchi with *R. macroglossa* as junior synonym)

Dr Lynch would have supported any alternative that would remove the threat of *R. maculata* Daudin within *Eleutherodactylus*. Once that question is settled (by any solution except Sabrosky's Alternative A) the choice between *maculata* Brocchi, *macroglossa* and *melanosoma* for that species can be considered. The usages he cited support Alternative C, but no great issue is involved because there is general awareness of the competition between *maculata* Brocchi and *macroglossa*, as shown by the frequency of citations in the form '*maculata* (=*macroglossa*)' or its equivalent.

REQUEST FOR ADVICE

10. From all the above it appears that Sabrosky's Alternative A would not provide an acceptable result; his Alternative B is no longer relevant in view of the 1972 changes to the former Article 23b. The choice is therefore between his alternatives C and D, and the Commission seeks the advice of workers on this group of anurans on this choice. Usage since 1979 may have some influence on this, though probably not of very much weight. Smith & Lynch, in replying to Sabrosky, showed that Alternative C requires only one use of the plenary powers whereas Alternative D needs three. This is a subjective factor compared to the objective criteria used by the applicants in preferring *maculata* Brocchi to *macroglossa*. The main purpose of this report is to prepare the ground for a clear-cut decision by the Commission.

HYPOCRYPHALUS MANGIFERAE (STEBBING, 1914), (INSECTA, COLEOPTERA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.)2142

By Stephen L. Wood (*Department of Zoology, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah*)

Stebbing (1903, p. 68) described *Hypothenemus* (?) sp. Later (Stebbing, 1914, p. 542) he named it *Cryphalus (Hypothenemus) mangiferae* from specimens collected in Eastern Dun, United Provinces, India, from newly matured specimens taken from mango (*Mangifera indica*) on 11 May, 1902. This species has spread to virtually all tropical parts of the world where mangoes are grown. The species was transferred to *Hypocryphalus* by Beeson (1929, p. 226). Numerous references to this well known, economically important species occur in the literature.

2. I was unable to find Stebbing's specimens of this species at the Forest Research Institute at Dehra Dun; however, four callow specimens labelled 'India, E. P. Stebbing, 1902–309' were found in the British Museum (Natural History); the first two also bear the label 'Mango twigs'. These four specimens bear the determination label *'Cryphalus mangiferae* Stb., C. Beeson det.'. Since Stebbing did not label types in the modern sense, these specimens are recognized as his syntypes. The first specimen, a female from 'Eastern Dun, India', was designated as lectotype for *Cryphalus mangiferae* Stebbing, now in *Hypocryphalus*, in *Great Basin Naturalist Memoirs*, vol. 6, p. 871 (1982).

3. During my recent review of North and Central American species of this family, two previously undetected senior synonyms of *H. mangiferae* were found. These include: (a) *Cryphalus inops* Eichhoff (1872, p. 331) that was based on one female in very poor condition from Guadeloupe Island and now in the Brussels Museum, and (b) *Hypothenemus griseus* Blackburn (1885, p. 194) that was based on one female from Oahu, Hawaiian Islands and now in the British Museum (Natural History). The few published references to *C. inops* (4) and *H. griseus* (3) cite the original establishment of the name or the type specimen and provide no additional information. The holotype of *C. inops* is in very poor condition and is recognised as this species with great difficulty; the holotype of *H. griseus* is recognizable.

4. One homonymous junior synonym, *Hypocryphalus mangiferae* Eggers (1928, p. 85), was named from Brazil; the lectotype is in the U.S. National Museum. This lectotype, as well as all other type material referred to above, has been examined and compared to my series of this species.

5. In order to conserve the established name of a common, widely distributed, economically important species, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to rule that the specific name *mangiferae* Stebbing, 1914, as published in the binomen *Hypocryphalus mangiferae* is to be given nomenclatural precedence over the specific name *inops* Eichhoff, 1872, as published in the binomen *Cryphalus inops* and *griseus* Blackburn, 1885, as published in the binomen *Hypothenemus griseus*, by anyone who considers that these three names denote the same taxon;

(2) to place the following names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(a) *mangiferae* Stebbing, 1914, as published in the binomen *Hypocryphalus mangiferae*, with an endorsement that it is to be given nomenclatural precedence over *Cryphalus inops* Eichhoff, 1872 and *Hypothenemus griseus* Blackburn, 1885, by anyone who considers that these three names denote the same taxon;

(b) *griseus* Blackburn, 1885 and *inops* Eichhoff, 1872, with an endorsement that they are not to be given nomenclatural priority over *mangiferae* Stebbing, 1914, by anyone who considers that these three names denote the same taxon.

REFERENCES

BEESON, C. F. C. 1929. Platypodidae and Scolytidae. *Insects of Samoa*, vol. 4 (4), pp. 217–248.

BLACKBURN, T. 1885. *In:* Blackburn & Sharp, Memoirs on the Coleoptera of the Hawaiian Islands. *Trans. r. Soc. Dublin*, (2) vol. 3, pp. 119–300.

EGGERS, H. 1928. Ipidae (Coleoptera) da America do Sul. *Archiv. Inst. Biol. Def. Agric. Anim.*, vol. 1, pp. 83–99.

EICHHOFF, W. J. 1872. Neue exotischen Tomiciden-Arten. *Berliner Entomol. Zeitschr.*, vol. 15, p. 136.

STEBBING, E. P. 1903. *H. hypothenemus* (?) sp. *Indian Museum Notes*, vol. 6, p. 68.

—— 1914. *Indian Forest Insects of Economic Importance*. Coleoptera. Eyre and Spottiswoode, London. 648 pp.

A list of ten references to the use of *Hypocryphalus mangiferae* since 1925 is held in the Commission's Office.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature wishes to express its appreciation of the facilities provided by the Trustees of the British Museum (Natural History) for the Secretariat of the Commission.

CONTENTS

	Page
Officers and Members of the Commission	v
Members of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature	vi
Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology	129
Special Announcements	130

Comments

On the type species of *Anolis* Daudin, 1802. E.E. Williams & H.M. Smith; A.F. Stimson	132
On the proposed use of the plenary powers to suppress the holotype and to designate a neotype for *Galago crassicaudatus* E. Geoffroy, 1812 (Primates, Galagidae). W.F.H. Ansell	136
On the proposed designation of a type species for *Indodorylaimus* Ali & Prabha, 1974 (Nematoda, Dorylaimida). M.R. Siddiqi; Q.H. Baqri	137
On the proposal to emend Z.N.(S.)2401 by designating *Apis pilipes* as type species of *Megilla* Fabricius. C.D. Michener	138

New and revived cases

Explication du vote sur le projet de la troisième édition du Code International de Nomenclature Zoologique. C. Dupuis	141
International Code of Zoological Nomenclature: amendment proposed to third edition. Proposal concerning Article 51c. R.J. Gagné & F.C. Thompson and L.V. Knutson	149
International Code of Zoological Nomenclature: proposed amendment to third edition: Article 59b. Z. Boucek	151
Request for a declaration clarifying the meaning of the expressions 'Suppressed for Nomenclatural Purposes' and 'Rejected for Nomenclatural Purposes' and the status of information in works that are rejected under Articles 8 and 9 of the Code, L.B. Holthuis, W.D.L. Ride and C.W. Sabrosky	152
A proposed amendment to Article 70b of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature on misidentified type species. C.W. Sabrosky	156
Comment on Dr Sabrosky's proposed amendment to Article 70. The Secretary	158
Williamia Monterosato, 1884 (Mollusca, Gastropoda): proposed conservation. H.B. Rehder	159
Tibicina Amyot, 1847 and *Lyristes* Horváth, 1926 (Insecta, Hemiptera, Homoptera): proposed conservation by the suppression of *Tibicen* Berthold, 1827. R.V. Melville and R.W. Sims	163
Arguments pour la suppression du nom de genre *Tibicen* et de ses dérivés dans la nomenclature de la superfamille des CICADOIDEA. M. Boulard	166
Rana maculata Brocchi, 1877 and *Eleutherodactylus richmondi* Stejneger, 1904 (Amphibia, Salientia): proposed conservation. The Secretary	185
Hypocryphalus mangiferae (Stebbing, 1914), (Insecta, Coleoptera): proposed conservation under the plenary powers. S.L. Wood	189

Printed in Great Britain by Henry Ling Ltd., at the Dorset Press, Dorchester, Dorset

25 2 102

30 November 1984 Volume 41 Part 4
pp. vii–viii, 191–288, T.P., I–VI
ISSN 0007-5167

The Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature

The Official Organ of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

JAN 1985

COMMONWEALTH AGRICULTURAL BUREAUX

The Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature

Published by: **Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux**

On behalf of: **International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature**
c/o British Museum (Natural History)
Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.

Orders and enquiries concerning subscriptions and back numbers should be sent to:

CENTRAL SALES
COMMONWEALTH AGRICULTURAL BUREAUX
FARNHAM ROYAL
SLOUGH SL2 3BN, U.K.

© *International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature 1984.* All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronically, mechanically, by photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

JAN 1985
LIBRARY

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

President: Dr. W.D.L. RIDE *(School of Applied Science, Canberra College of Advanced Education, P.O. Box 1, Belconnen, A.C.T. 2616, Australia).*

Vice-President: Prof. Per BRINCK *(Ecology Building, University of Lund, S-223 62, Lund, Sweden).*

Secretary: Mr. R.V. MELVILLE *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD).*

B. The Members of the Commission

(Arranged in order of election or of most recent re-election)

Prof. Per BRINCK *(Ecology Building, University of Lund, S-223 62, Lund, Sweden)* (30 September 1972) *(Vice-President)* **Arthropoda; Ecology**

Prof. Dr. Raphael ALVARADO *(Departamento de Zoologia, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Madrid, Madrid 28040, Spain)* (30 September 1972) **Echinoidea; Asteroidea**

Prof. E. BINDER *(Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle, CH 1211 Geneva 6, Switzerland)* (30 September 1972) **Mollusca**

Dr. L.B. HOLTHUIS *(Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands)* (30 September 1972) *(Councillor)* **Crustacea**

Dr. G. BERNARDI *(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005, Paris, France)* (30 September 1972) *(Councillor)* **Lepidoptera**

Prof. C. DUPUIS *(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005, Paris, France)* (30 September 1972) **Heteroptera**

Dr. M. MROCZKOWSKI *(Instytut Zoologiczny, Polska Akademia Nauk. ul. Wilcza 64, Warsaw, Poland)* (14 March 1975) **Coleoptera**

Prof. Dr. Otto KRAUS *(Zoologisches Institut und Zoologisches Museum, 2000 Hamburg 13, Germany)* (29 September 1976) **Arachnida, Myriapoda**

Dr. W.D.L. RIDE *(School of Applied Science, Canberra College of Advanced Education, P.O. Box 1, Belconnen, A.C.T. 2616, Australia)* (29 September 1976) *(President):* **Mammalia: Recent and Fossil**

Dr. Curtis W. SABROSKY *(Systematic Entomology Lab., USDA c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.)* (29 September 1976) **Diptera**

Dr. H.G. COGGER *(Australian Museum, Sydney 2000, N.S.W. Australia)* (29 September 1976) **Reptilia: E D P Methods**

Prof. Dr. Gerhard HAHN *(Fachbereich Geowissenschaften, Universitätsgebiet Lahnberge, 3550 Marburg, BRD)* (27 December 1978) **Palaeontology**

Prof. Dr. O. HALVORSEN *(Institute of Biology and Geology, University of Tromsö, P.O. Box 790, N-9001 Tromsö, Norway)* (27 December 1978) **Parasitology**

Dr. V.A. TRJAPITZIN *(Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad B-164, USSR)* (27 December 1978) **Entomology**

Dr. F.M. BAYER *(U.S. National Museum of Natural History, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.)* (23 August 1979) *(Councillor)* **Octocorallia; Systematics**

Prof. John O. CORLISS *(University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, U.S.A.)* (23 August 1979) **Protozoa; Systematics**

Mr. R.V. MELVILLE *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD)* (23 August 1979) *(Secretary)* **Palaeontology**

Dr. Y.I. STAROBOGATOV *(Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad 199164, U.S.S.R.)* (23 August 1979) **Mollusca, Crustacea**

Dr. P.T. LEHTINEN *(Zoological Museum, Department of Biology, University of Turku. SF-20500 Turku 50, Finland)* (8 August 1980) **Arachnida**

Dr. L.R.M. COCKS *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London, SW7 5BD)* (26 August 1982) **Brachiopoda**

Mr. David HEPPELL, *(Department of Natural History, Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh EH1 1JF, Scotland)* (26 August 1982) *(Councillor)* **Mollusca**

Prof. Jay M. SAVAGE *(Department of Biology, University of Miami, P.O. Box 249118, Coral Gables, Florida 33124, U.S.A.)* (26 August 1982) **Herpetology**

Prof. R. SCHUSTER *(Institut für Zoologie, Universität Graz, Universitätsplatz 2, A–8010 Graz, Austria)* (26 August 1982) **Acari**

Dr. SHUN-ICHI UENO *(Department of Zoology, National Science Museum, Hyakunincho 3-23-1, Shinjukuku, Tokyo 160, Japan)* (26 August 1982) **Entomology**

Prof. A. WILLINK *(Universidad Nacional de Tucumán, Instituto Miguel Lillo, Miguel Lillo 205, 4000 Tucumán, Argentina)* (26 August 1982) **Neotropical Hymenoptera**

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Members of the Trust

Professor H.B. Whittington, F.R.S. *(Chairman)*
Dr. F.G.W. Jones *(Secretary and Managing Director)*
Prof. Per Brinck
Prof. J.H. Callomon, F.R.S.C.
Prof. C.B. Cox, F.G.S.
Prof. D. Curry, F.G.S.
The Rt. Hon. the Earl of Cranbrook, F.L.S., F.Z.S.
Sir Arthur Drew, K.C.B.
Sir Charles Fleming, K.B.E., F.R.S.
Prof. J. Forest
Col. Francis J. Griffin, O.B.E.
Dr. G.C. Gruchy
Dr. R.H. Hedley, F.I.Biol.
Dr. L.B. Holthuis
Sir Peter Kent, F.R.S.
Prof. Dr. O. Kraus
Dr. M. Luc
Dr. I.W.B. Nye
Dr. E.P.F. Rose, T.D.
Dr. W.D.L. Ride *(ex officio)*
Sir Eric Smith, F.R.S.
Dr. G.B. White
Prof. J.M. Dodd, F.R.S. *(Observer for the Royal Society)*

B. The Officers of the Trust

Mr. R.V. Melville, M.Sc. *(Scientific Controller)*
Mr. M.E. Tollitt, M.Sc., F.L.S., F.R.E.S. *(Assistant Zoologist)*
Mr. J.D.D. Smith, F.G.S. *(Administrator)*

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 41, part 4 (pp. vii–viii, 191–288, T.P., I–VI) 30 November 1984

NOTICES

(a) *Date of commencement of voting.* In normal circumstances the Commission may start to vote on applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* six months after the publication of each application. Any zoologist who wishes to comment on any of the applications in the present part is invited to send his contribution, in duplicate, to the Secretariat of the Commission as quickly as possible, and in any case in time to reach the Secretariat before the close of the six-month period.

(b) *Possible use of the plenary powers.* The possible use by the Commission of its plenary powers is involved in the following applications published in the present part of the *Bulletin* (any marked with an asterisk involve the application of Articles 23a–b and 79b):

*(1) THRESKIORNITHIDAE Richmond, 1917 (Aves): application to place on Official List of family-group names in zoology and to give precedence over PLATALEINAE Bonaparte, 1838 and other competing family-group names. Z.N.(S.) 2136. E. Eisenmann (deceased), E. Mayr & K.C. Parkes.

(2) *Cricetodon minus* [sic] Lartet, 1851 (Mammalia, Rodentia): revised request for a ruling on interpretation. Z.N.(S.) 1854. The Secretary.

(3) Report on *Glyphipterix* Hübner, [1825] (Insecta, Lepidoptera): Z.N.(S.) 2115. The Secretary.

(4) *Octolasion* Örley, 1885 (Annelida, Oligochaeta, Lumbricidae): ratification of the designation of the type species and the introduction of *Octolasion* (*Octodrilus*) by Omodeo, 1956 in accordance with usage, with the suppression of the designation of the type species and of the names *Octolasion* (*Incolore*) and *Octolasion* (*Purpureum*) by Omodeo, 1952. Z.N.(S.) 2469. R.W. Sims.

(5) *Leptosia* Hübner, 1818 (Insecta, Lepidoptera): correction to Opinion 584 and to the Official List. Z.N.(S.) 1324. C.F. Cowan.

(6) Revised submission regarding the nominal genus *Diplosoma* MacDonald, 1859 (Ascidiacea), and proposed alternative designation of *Leptoclinum fulgens* Milne Edwards, 1841, as type species of *Leptoclinum* Milne Edwards, 1841. Z.N.(S.) 1766. F.W.E. Rowe.

(7) *Drymus ryeii* Douglas & Scott, 1865 (Hemiptera, Lygaeidae): proposed ratification of the status of a lectotype with a request to set the neotype aside. Z.N.(S.) 1214. L. Jessop.

*(8) *Aphodius rufus* Moll, 1782 and *Aegialia rufa* Fabricius, 1792 (Insecta, Coleoptera): proposed conservation under the plenary powers by suppression of *Aphodius scybalarius* Fabricius, 1792. Z.N.(S.) 2318. Z. Stebnicka.

*(9) Proposed use of plenary powers to conserve certain junior synonyms in the family PYGOPIDAE (Brachiopoda). Z.N.(S.) 2300. F.A. Middlemiss.

*(10) *Delphinus truncatus* Montagu, 1821 (Mammalia, Cetacea): proposed conservation by suppression of *Delphinus nesarnack* Lacepède, 1804. Z.N.(S.) 2082. D.W. Rice.

(c) *Receipt of new applications.* The following new applications have been received since the publication of vol. 41(3) on 23 August 1984 (any marked with an asterisk involve the application of Articles 23a–b and 79b):

(1) *Elachista* Treitschke, 1833 and ELACHISTIDAE Bruand, 1850 (Insecta, Lepidoptera, Elachistidae): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2481. E.S. Nielsen & I.W.B. Nye.

(2) The authorship and dates of Sowerby's *Mineral Conchology of Great Britain*. Z.N.(S.) 2483. C.W. Wright & R.J. Cleevely.

(3) *Olpium* L. Koch, 1873 (Arachnida, Pseudoscorpionida, Olpiidae): proposed designation of type species and related problems. Z.N.(S.) 2484. M.S. Harvey & V. Mahnert.

(4) *Cholus* Germar, 1824 (Insecta, Coleoptera): proposed conservation, Z.N.(S.) 2485. C.W. O'Brien & G.J. Wibmer.

*(5) *Dryophthorus* Germar, 1824 (Insecta, Coleoptera): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2486. C.W. O'Brien & G. Osella.

*(6) *Lachnopus* Schoenherr, 1840 (Insecta, Coleoptera): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2487. C.W. O'Brien & G.J. Wibmer.

(7) *Nemocestes* Van Dyke, 1936 (Insecta, Coleoptera): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2488. C.W. O'Brien.

*(8) *Zygops* Schoenherr, 1825 (Insecta, Coleoptera): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2489. C. W. O'Brien & G. J. Wibmer.

R.V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
November 1984

FINANCIAL REPORT FOR YEAR ENDING 31 DECEMBER 1983

The *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* brought in £11,306 during 1983 and of this £10,000 is due to the arrangement with the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux under which the Bureaux manages printing and sales. The sum received is £3,476 less than the previous year when income was greatly augmented by the collection of outstanding debts prior to the arrangement with C.A.B. New grants from three Research Councils (Agriculture and Fisheries Research Council, Natural Environment Research Council and the Science and Engineering Research Council) and from the Royal Society brought in £7,000 against £3,791 from other sources in the previous year. The Appeal for funds raised £41,793 (£5,168 in 1982) and Covenanted Income was £2,880 (£2,406 in 1982). Bank interest received was £4,410 (£4,952). Expenditure on salaries almost doubled due to the appointment of Mr Adrian Penrose to assist Mr Richard Melville, but this increase was balanced by the absence of printing costs for the *Bulletin*, these being borne by the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux.

An electric typewriter was purchased to replace an obsolete model (£459). The switch to billing in advance by the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux for sales of the *Bulletin* has led to confusion and it is proving difficult to collect money for the Trust's sales in 1981 paid in arrears, £1,707 being outstanding. Surplus funds were invested in National Savings Income Bonds (£45,000 Appeal Money, £40,000 Trust Money, total £85,000). The number of creditors was reduced (£125 versus £1,786). Deposited Covenants were similar (£3,475 versus £4,650). Total reserves increased from £56,703 to £106,697, of which £18,159 is earmarked for the printing of the 3rd Edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature.

Largely as a result of the Appeal for Funds ably managed by Mr Richard Melville, the grants received from the Royal Society and the Research Councils, and the arrangements with the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, the Trust's financial position greatly improved in 1983. The reserves generate income which assists in the payment of staff and will provide a buffer against impending changes in the staffing of the Secretariat in London, and changes in the structure and functioning of the Commission worldwide shortly to be proposed by its President, Dr W.D.L. Ride.

F.G.W. JONES
Secretary
4th June 1984
International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE
BALANCE SHEET AS AT 31st DECEMBER, 1983

1982				
		FIXED ASSETS		
		OFFICE EQUIPMENT at cost	800	
		Additions during the year	459	
			1,259	
		Less: Accumulated Depreciation	634	
235				625
		CURRENT ASSETS		
3,016		Amounts due from Sales	1,707	
824		Income and other Taxes recoverable	1,452	
–		Investment	85,000	
59,064		Cash at Bank and in Hand	21,513	
	62,904			109,672
	63,139			110,297
		CURRENT LIABILITIES		
1,786		Sundry Creditors	125	
4,650		Deposited Covenants Received in Advance	3,475	
	6,436			3,600
	56,703			106,697
		ACCUMULATED FUNDS		
		REVENUE RESERVE		
24,034		Balance at 31st December, 1982	38,344	
14,310		Surplus for 1983	50,194	
	38,344			88,538
	18,359	Specific Provision		18,159
	£56,703			£106,697

NOTE: The provision for printing of the 3rd Edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature is made up as follows:

Specific Donations	9,359
Appropriations from Trust Funds	7,000
Interest free Loan	2,000
Less: Photocopies of Revised Code	(200)
	£18,159

P. E. KENT (Signed) Members of the

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE
INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31st DECEMBER, 1983

1982			1983	
		SALE OF PUBLICATIONS		
14,782		Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature	11,306	
7		International Code	13	
93		Official Lists	–	
297		Opinions	1	
	15,179			11,320
3,791		GRANTS	7,000	
5,168		APPEAL FUND	41,793	
2,406		DEEDS OF COVENANT	2,880	
4,952		BANK INTEREST	4,410	
	16,317			56,083
	31,496			67,403
		Less:		
8,610		SALARIES	14,852	
2,558		OFFICE EXPENSES	2,145	
125		AUDIT FEE	125	
337		PROVISION FOR BAD DEBTS	–	
5,530		PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION OF PUBLICATIONS	18	
26		DEPRECIATION OF OFFICE EQUIPMENT	69	
	17,186			17,209
	£14,310	SURPLUS FOR THE YEAR carried to BALANCE SHEET		£50,194

REPORT OF THE AUDITORS

In our opinion the Accounts of the Trust which have been prepared under the historical cost convention give a true and fair view of the state of affairs at 31st December, 1983 and of the operating Surplus for the year ended on that date and comply with the Companies Acts 1948 to 1980.

3, Kings Head Yard,
London, SE1 1NA

29th May, 1984

MORLEY, GRAYRIGGE & CO.
Chartered Accountants

INTERNATIONAL CODE OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE THIRD EDITION

Publication of the third edition of the Code is now scheduled for 31 December 1984. The price remains at £15+£1.50 packing and postage. Prepaid orders sent to Publications Department, British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD will attract a 10 per cent discount (i.e. the price will be £13.50+£1.50 packing and postage) if received before 31 March 1985.

As it is always possible that publication may be delayed, and in view of the time that must elapse before the Code becomes generally available, readers may like to have notice of the most important new provisions that will come into force on 1 January 1985. These are:

(1) A species-group name may be added in parentheses after the generic name, or interpolated in parentheses between the generic and specific names to denote an aggregate of species (e.g., a group of sibling species) within a genus or subgenus; and a species-group name may be interpolated between the specific and subspecific names to indicate an aggregate of subspecies (e.g., an exerge) within a species (Article 6b). Such interpolated names are not counted among the names in a binomen or trinomen but are deemed to be consistent with the Principle of Binominal Nomenclature.

(2) The mandatory provisions concerning the formation and treatment of species-group names that were present in the first edition (1961) but were reduced to a Recommendation in the second edition (1964) are restored and extended (Article 31).

(3) If a vowel in a name formed from a German word bears an umlaut, the umlaut is simply to be deleted (prior to 1985, the letter 'e' is to be inserted after that vowel). If there is any doubt that a name is based on a German word, it is to be so treated (Article 32d(i) (2)).

(4) A new name published before 1961 for a 'variety' or a 'form' is of subspecific rank unless the context clearly reveals that infrasubspecific rank was meant. The name is then of infrasubspecific rank unless, before 1985, it was treated as an available name of specific or subspecific rank (Article 45g(ii) (1)).

(5) In extant species of protozoa, if the name cannot be interpreted by reference to a single animal or part of one, the type may consist of a series of directly related individuals representing differing stages in the life cycle (hapantotype) (Article 72c(iv)).

(6) Lastly, a work published before 1986 must be produced in ink on paper by some conventional printing process. After 1985 a work produced by any other method (e.g., xeroxing) must, to be available, contain a statement by the author that any new name or nomenclatural act in it is intended for permanent, public, scientific record; and information showing that the work was produced in an edition containing simultaneously obtainable copies must be given in the work itself (Article 8c, d).

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
November 1984

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *CAPYS* HEWITSON, 1865.Z.N.(S.)1748
(see vol. 41, pp. 119–121)

By C. F. Cowan (*4 Thornfield Terrace, Grange-over-Sands, Cumbria, LA11 7DR, U.K.*)

I support this proposal, but cannot agree with its method of presentation. I mainly agree with paragraphs 1 to 6.

Scoptes Hübner, 1819 was dealt with by Hemming, 1967 (*op. posth.*, edited by Riley: *Bull. Br. Mus. nat. Hist.(Ent.)* Suppl. 9, p. 407) where he firmly stated that Butler's action in '1869' [1870] made *alpheus* the type species. This was a positive designation by Hemming and he made it quite clear that he considered it the type species; thereby fully satisfying Article 69a(iii).

Thus paragraphs 7–11 on page 120 are irrelevant, as is paragraph 12(1)(a), in which '*alphaeus* . . . p. 31 etc.' should read *alpheus* . . . p. 131.

Accordingly, I recommend that the request to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature be shortened by the omission of subparagraph (1) (a).

CORRECTIONS TO THE APPLICATION CONCERNING *HELICONIUS ERATO* AURIVILLIUS, 1882. Z.N.(S.)1759
(see vol. 41, pp. 43–44)

By John R. G. Turner (*Department of Genetics, University of Leeds, West Yorkshire, England*)

I am grateful to Lt.-Col. C. F. Cowan and Professor Dr L. B. Holthuis for the following factual corrections to my application:

paragraph 3, line 3 should begin 'B (red form). Clerck (1764, *Icones*, part 2, pl. 40, fig. 1)'. Clerck's figure bears the number '5' beside it; but the other figures on this plate bear numbers scattered among the hundreds, and the Index numbers them 1–4 from the top down, giving the number 1 to *P. erato*.
paragraph 3, lines 7–8 should read: 'Species B (blue form) *Papilio doris* Cramer, (1777, *Uitl. Kapellen*, vol. 2, p. 33, pl. 119, fig. A) . . .'
paragraph 3, lines 9–10. Linnaeus died in 1778, and never cited Cramer. Posthumous editions (e.g. Gmelin, 1790; Turton, 1806) cite Cramer's figure as *P. erato*.

paragraph 6, lines 5–6, the locality of the neotype should have been cited as 'Berg en Dal', not 'Berg. en Dal'.

COMMENT ON THE APPLICATION CONCERNING *STERNOTHERUS* GRAY, 1825 AND *PELUSIOS* WAGLER, 1830. Z.N.(S.)2278
(see vol. 37, pp. 124–128)

By Roger Bour and Alain Dubois (*Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Reptiles et Amphibiens, Paris*)

The correct spelling of the generic name *Sternotherus* Gray, 1825 was recently debated by Smith, Smith & Chiszar, 1980; those authors there acknowledged the availability of the generic name *Sternothaerus* Bell, 1825 and considered some consequences of the priority of that name over *Pelusios* Wagler, 1830, at present universally used. At about the same time we independently submitted the first draft of a paper on the same subject, but including wider implications. The present paper is a revised form of that draft. In it we examine those wider implications at both genus-group and family-group levels, consider several possible courses of action and their consequences, and request the Commission to choose the course that we believe will best secure stability of nomenclature. Our paper should be read in conjunction with Smith, Smith & Chiszar's application to the Commission in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 124–128.

2. We agree with those authors' analysis of the relationship between *Sternotherus* Gray, 1825 and *Sternothaerus* Bell, 1825, and take up the historical sequence of events with the work of Wagler, 1830. He did not expressly designate a type species for *Sternothaerus* but restricted the genus to *S. trifasciatus* Bell. He also (p. 137) established the new genus *Pelusios* with three included nominal species: *Emys castanea* Schweigger, 1812, p. 314; *Testudo subnigra* Lacépède, 1788, p. 446; and *Sternothaerus leachianus* Bell, 1825 (already designated as type species of *Sternothaerus* by Bell, 1828, p. 514).

3. A junior synonym of *Pelusios* that does not appear in Wermuth & Mertens's (1977, pp. 115–116) synonymy of the generic name, is *Cheliphus* Rafinesque, 1832. This name was first introduced by Rafinesque (1815, p. 75) as a nomen nudum. Later (1832, p. 64) he gave a diagnosis of the genus but did not include any species in it:

> '*Cheliphus* Raf. Water turtles with valved shells, 5 claws and toes to all the feet.'

The name seems never to have been used and no species have ever been referred to the genus. The diagnosis is, however, quite clear. The combination of characters given therein is met with in only one genus of Recent turtles, *Pelusios* Wagler (type species, by subsequent designation by Fitzinger, 1843, p. 29, *Testudo subnigra* Lacépède, 1788). Fortunately, *Pelusios* has priority over *Cheliphus*. We hereby designate *Testudo subnigra* Lacépède, 1788 as type species of *Cheliphus* Rafinesque, 1832, which thereby becomes a junior objective synonym of *Pelusios* Wagler, 1830.

4. Gray, 1831, p. 37, gave a new definition and content to *Sternotherus* (which he still credited to Bell). He did not designate a type species. He included the following two species in the genus as newly understood: *Emys castanea* Schweigger (with which he considered *Sternothaerus leachianus* Bell to be synonymous) and *Testudo subnigra* Lacépède. (Smith, Smith & Chiszar, 1980, p. 126, consider *S. leachianus* to be a junior synonym of *T. subnigra*. Bell's type specimen is still extant in the collections of the Oxford University Museum (OUM 8618). We have examined it and agree with Gray that the name is a synonym of *Emys castanea* Schweigger, 1812). In 1844 Gray followed the same arrangement but added two further species to the genus.

5. In a list of genera, Swainson, 1839, p. 344, mentioned *Sternotherus* as a subgenus of *Kinosternon* Spix, 1824, p. 17. Holbrook, 1842, p. 133, used *Sternothaerus* Bell with the same meaning, i.e. for the species *Testudo odorata* Latreille. Fitzinger, 1843, p. 29, was the first formally to designate *Testudo odorata* Latreille as type species of *Sternothaerus* Bell, but that is invalid because subsequent to Bell's 1828 designation of *S. leachianus*. In the same work, p. 29, Fitzinger designated *Testudo subnigra* Lacépède as type species of *Pelusios* Wagler and that action is valid.

6. In 1855, p. 51, Gray at last used Bell's spelling *Sternothaerus* for the genus he had since 1825 called *Sternotherus*. He mentioned Bell's 1828 type-species designation and considered *Pelusios* to be a synonym of *Sternothaerus*. Smith. Smith & Chiszar overlooked this use by Gray of Bell's spelling.

7. For nearly half a century from 1855, the use of *Sternothaerus* in the sense of Bell, 1828, and Gray, 1855 was almost general (see e.g. Strauch, 1862, p. 43; Boulenger, 1889, pp. 191–197) and *Pelusios* was treated as a synonym of *Sternothaerus*. That stable usage was upset by Stejneger, who in 1902, p. 237, considered *Testudo odorata* as the type species of both *Sternotherus* and *Sternothaerus* and synonymised both with *Kinosternon* Spix. He used *Pelusios* as the valid name for the genus that until then had been called *Sternothaerus*.

8. Brown, 1908, p. 114, used *Sternothaerus* sensu Stejneger (= *Sternotherus* Gray) for *Testudo odorata*, which he clearly mentioned as the type species, as a genus distinct from *Kinosternon*; Wright & Funkhouser, 1915, p. 114, used *Sternothaerus* in the same sense for *Aromochelys carinata* Gray, 1855, p. 47. Stejneger, 1923, p. 1, also without explanation, separated *Sternotherus* Gray from *Kinosternon* and referred three species to it. From that date, this use of *Sternotherus* has been accepted by most authors. A few authors (Lindholm, 1929, p. 277; Tinkle, 1958, p. 5; Conant, 1958, pp. 35–39) used the spelling *Sternothaerus*, which Tinkle thought was justified on etymological grounds, but this was rightly refuted by Albrecht (1967, p. 82). *Sternotherus* Gray is currently considered as the valid generic name for four species of North American turtles: see e.g. Ernst & Barbour, 1972, pp. 33–49. *Sternothaerus* Brown, 1908 is a junior homonym of *Sternothaerus* Bell. It is also an unjustified emendation of *Sternotherus* Gray with its own author and date, and is a junior objective synonym of that name.

9. Schmidt, 1919, pp. 401–402, 411–415, followed Stejneger's 1902 use of *Pelusios* as the valid name for *Sternothaerus* Bell and referred six species to the genus. From that date — but not from 1902 on, as stated by Smith, Smith & Chiszar, 1980, p. 126 — this usage has been generally accepted (see e.g. Hewitt, 1927, p. 375; FitzSimons, 1932, p. 37; Mertens, Müller & Rust, 1934, p. 64; Loveridge, 1941, p. 481; Müller & Hellmich, 1954, p. 54; Laurent, 1956, p. 31; Villiers, 1958, p. 230; Wermuth & Mertens, 1961, p. 286; Laurent, 1965, p. 1; Pritchard, 1967, p. 224; Raw, 1978, p. 287). All the species concerned are freshwater turtles with a hinged plastron. Species with this character were at first believed to be closely related, but they are now placed in the three families EMYDIDAE, PELOMEDUSIDAE and KINOSTERNIDAE.

10. In the same paper in which he established *Sternothaerus*, Bell erected for it a new subfamily STERNOTHAERINA which he placed in the EMYDIDAE — a family in fact established by Gray one month earlier. Cope, 1868, p. 119, proposed STERNOTHAERIDAE as a new name without referring to Bell, but under Article 36 the name is available as of Bell, 1825. In the same paper, p. 119, Cope erected the PELOMEDUSIDAE for *Pelomedusa* Wagler, 1830, p. 136 (type species, by monotypy, *Testudo galeata* Schoepff, 1792, p. 12 = *Testudo subrufa* Lacépède, 1788,

p. 446). Gray, 1870, pp. 70, 77, independently proposed PELOMEDUSIDAE for a family containing *Sternothaerus* Bell, 1825, *Pelomedusa* Wagler, 1830 and *Dumerilia* Grandidier, 1867.

11. As was recognized later by most authors, *Sternothaerus* Bell (= *Pelusios* Wagler) and *Pelomedusa* Wagler are closely related and belong to the same subfamily. STERNOTHAERIDAE Bell, 1825 and PELOMEDUSIDAE Cope, 1868 are therefore subjective synonyms. Baur at first (1887, p. 102; 1888a, p. 420) recognized both families as valid, but later (1888b, p. 738) placed both genera in one family for which he chose the name STERNOTHAERIDAE. However, except for another paper by him (Baur, 1891, pp. 417, 420), that name does not seem to have been used subsequently, because Boulenger, 1889, p. 191, chose PELOMEDUSIDAE as the name for this family with STERNOTHAERIDAE as a synonym. This usage has been followed by all herpetologists until now (see e.g. Siebenrock, 1909, p. 554; Schmidt, 1919, p. 411; Mertens, Müller & Rust, 1934, p. 64; Loveridge, 1941, p. 465; Laurent, 1956, p. 30; Villiers, 1958, p. 222; Wermuth & Mertens, 1961, p. 284; Laurent, 1965, p. 1; Pritchard, 1967, p. 220; Raw, 1978, p. 287).

12. The family to which *Sternotherus* Gray belongs since Stejneger's 1902 paper was given the name CINOSTERNOIDAE by Agassiz, 1857, p. 346. This name was based on *Cinosternon* Wagler, 1830, p. 137, an unjustified emendation of *Kinosternon* Spix. Gray, 1869, p. 180 proposed two family-group names based on *Kinosternon*: KINOSTERNA for a 'section' (subfamily) and KINOSTERNINA for a tribe. KINOSTERNIDAE, first used as such by Baur, 1893, p. 674, is available as of Gray, 1869 (Article 36). Although CINOSTERNOIDAE (which should be corrected to CINOSTERNIDAE) has priority over KINOSTERNIDAE, the latter has replaced it since Stejneger & Barbour, 1917, p. 111 and has won general acceptance, either as a family name or a subfamily name (see e.g. Lindholm, 1929, p. 277; Mertens, Müller & Rust, 1934, p. 43; Pope, 1939, p. 34; Carr, 1952, p. 73; Schmidt, 1953, p. 87; Tinkle, 1958, p. 5; Conant, 1958, p. 35; Wermuth & Mertens, 1961, p. 8; Pritchard, 1967, p. 33; Ernst & Barbour, 1972, p. 33). It should therefore be maintained in the interests of stability of nomenclature. As *Cinosternon* Wagler is a junior objective synonym of *Kinosternon* Spix, Article 40 applies and the name should be cited as KINOSTERNIDAE Gray, 1869 (1857).

13. The rediscovery of Bell's type-species designation for *Sternothaerus* could lead to major changes in the currently accepted nomenclature of turtles. These are three in number:

(a) *Sternothaerus* Bell should replace *Pelusios* Wagler. This might be accepted since *Sternothaerus* was in general use for almost a century, while *Pelusios* was resurrected only by Stejneger, 1902. However, *Pelusios* is now well established (from 1919 on — see paragraph 9) and this change would be considered by some authors as a threat to stability.

(b) STERNOTHAERIDAE Bell, 1825, which does not seem to have been used as a valid name since Baur, 1891, would become the valid name for the family now universally known (see paragraph 11) as PELOMEDUSIDAE. We believe this change would be most disturbing to stability.

(c) The co-existence of two generic names, *Sternotherus* and *Sternothaerus*, in different families would be a certain cause of confusion, especially among non-systematists.

14. We believe these consequences would disturb stability and cause confusion. Action by the Commission is therefore necessary. We see seven possible courses:

(a) Suppression of *Sternotherus* Gray (type species, by subsequent designation by Stejneger, 1902, *Testudo odorata* Latreille). This would prevent consequence 13c, but *Pelusios* would still have to be replaced by *Sternothaerus* and PELOMEDUSIDAE by STERNOTHAERIDAE. *Sternotherus* would be replaced by its junior objective synonym *Aromochelys* Gray, 1855, p. 46, given the same type species by Strauch, 1862, p. 38.

(b) Ruling that Gray's 1825 paper is to be considered as later than Bell's 1825 paper. *Sternotherus* Gray would then be an incorrect subsequent spelling of *Sternothaerus* Bell and would have no status in nomenclature. The result of this action would be as in (a), except that the family name EMYDIDAE would be credited to Bell (its true author) rather than to Gray (who merely used a manuscript name of Bell's).

(c) Suppression of Bell's designation of *Sternothaerus leachianus* Bell as type species of *Sternothaerus* and its replacement by *Testudo odorata* Latreille, as requested by Smith, Smith & Chiszar. *Sternothaerus* Bell would then become a junior objective synonym of *Sternotherus* Gray and consequence 13c would be avoided. The current use of *Pelusios* and of PELOMEDUSIDAE would be preserved. But STERNOTHAERIDAE Bell would replace KINOSTERNIDAE as the valid name of the family containing *Sternotherus* Gray. This consequence is not taken into account by Smith, Smith & Chiszar.

(d) Suppression of all previous designations of type species for *Sternothaerus* Bell (Bell, 1828, *S. leachianus*; Fitzinger, 1843, *T. odorata*; Stejneger, 1902, *T. odorata*) and designation of *S. trifasciatus* Bell as type species (thus ratifying Wagler's 1830 concept of the genus). *S. trifasciatus* is currently referred to *Cuora* Gray, 1855, p. 41, but has in the past (e.g. Boulenger, 1889, p. 133) been referred to *Cyclemys* Bell, 1834, p. 17. This designation would upset the stability of *Cuora*, which has been in general use for over 50 years (since Smith, M. A., 1931). A further consequence would be a change in the subfamilial nomenclature in the EMYDIDAE: STERNOTHAERINAE Bell, 1825 would replace BATAGURINAE Gray, 1869, a well-established name since McDowell, 1964. Finally, consequence 13c would not be avoided.

(e) Conservation of both *Sternotherus* Gray and *Sternothaerus* Bell, but suppression of STERNOTHAERINA Bell, 1825. This action is technically impossible, for so long as *Sternothaerus* remains available and nomenclaturally valid, any zoologist has the right to recognize it as the type genus of a family-group taxon. Moreover, none of the consequences spelt out in paragraph 13 would be avoided, because, as a result of Baur's first reviser action (1888b, p. 738), STERNOTHAERIDAE Cope, 1868 would still have precedence over PELOMEDUSIDAE Cope, 1868.

(f) As (e), but suppressing either STERNOTHAERIDAE Cope, 1868 as well, or Baur's first reviser action so as to make PELOMEDUSIDAE Cope, 1868 nomenclaturally valid. This would be technically

impossible for the same reason as that given in (e) and consequences 13a and 13c would not be avoided.

(g) Suppression of *Sternothaerus* Bell, 1825. STERNOTHAERINA Bell, 1825 and all family-group names based on the generic name would automatically become nomenclaturally invalid. All the consequences envisaged in paragraph 13 would be avoided. *Sternotherus* Gray, 1825 (KINOSTERNIDAE) and *Pelusios* Wagler, 1830 would remain valid names as currently used and PELOMEDUSIDAE Cope, 1868 would be conserved. We believe this action would avoid the introduction of sources of confusion and would preserve stability of nomenclature.

15. We accordingly ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

(a) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Sternothaerus* Bell, 1825 for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;

(b) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology
  (i) *Sternotherus* Gray, 1825 (gender: masculine), type species, by subsequent designation by Stejneger, 1902, *Testudo odorata* Latreille, 1801;
  (ii) *Pelusios* Wagler, 1830 (gender: masculine), type species, by subsequent designation by Fitzinger, 1843, *Testudo subnigra* Lacépède, 1788;
  (iii) *Pelomedusa* Wagler, 1830 (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Testudo galeata* Schoepff, 1792;
  (iv) *Kinosternon* Spix, 1824 (gender: neuter), type species, by subsequent designation by Bell, 1828, *Kinosternon longicaudatum* Spix, 1824;

(c) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology
  (i) *odorata* Latreille, 1801, as published in the binomen *Testudo odorata* (specific name of type species of *Sternotherus* Gray, 1825);
  (ii) *subnigra* Lacépède, 1788, as published in the binomen *Testudo subnigra* (specific name of type species of *Pelusios* Wagler, 1830);
  (iii) *galeata* Schoepff, 1792, as published in the binomen *Testudo galeata* (specific name of type species of *Pelomedusa* Wagler, 1830);
  (iv) *longicaudatum* Spix, 1824 as published in the binomen *Kinosternon longicaudatum* (specific name of type species of *Kinosternon* Spix, 1824);

(d) to place on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology
  (i) PELOMEDUSIDAE Cope, 1868 (type genus *Pelomedusa* Wagler, 1830);
  (ii) KINOSTERNIDAE Gray, 1869 (1857) (type genus *Kinosternon* Spix, 1824);

(e) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology
  (i) *Sternothaerus* Bell, 1825, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (a) above;
  (ii) *Sternothaerus* Brown, 1908, a junior homonym of *Sternothaerus* Bell, 1825;

(f) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology STERNOTHAERINA Bell, 1825 (type genus *Sternothaerus* Bell, 1825, suppressed under the plenary powers in (a) above).

REFERENCES

AGASSIZ, L. 1857. *Contributions to the natural history of the United States*, Monogr. 1, pts 2 and 3, 1xii + 643 pp., 34 pls. Boston (Little Brown).

ALBRECHT, P. W. 1967. The cranial arteries and cranial arterial foramina of the turtle genera *Chrysemys, Sternotherus* and *Trionyx*, etc. *Tulane Studies Zool.*, vol. 14, pp. 81–99.

BAUR, G. 1887. Osteologische Notizen über Reptilien, II. *Zool. Anz.*, vol. 10, pp. 96–102.

——— 1888a. Osteologische Notizen über Reptilien, III. *Zool. Anz.*, vol. 11, pp. 417–424.

——— 1888b. Osteologische Notizen über Reptilien, V. *Zool. Anz.*, vol. 11, pp. 736–740.

——— 1891. Notes on some little-known American fossil tortoises. *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia*, for 1891, pp. 411–430.

——— 1893. Notes on the classification and taxonomy of the Testudinata. *Proc. amer. philos. Soc.*, vol. 31, pp. 210–225.

BELL, T. 1825. A monograph of the tortoises having a moveable sternum, with remarks on their arrangement and affinities. *Zool. J.*, vol. 2, pp. 299–310.

——— 1828. Characters of the order, families and genera of the Testudinata. *Zool. J.*, vol. 3, pp. 513–516.

——— 1834. *Cyclemys, Cyclemys orbiculata. Proc. zool. Soc. London*, for 1834, p. 17.

BOULENGER, G. A. 1889. *Catalogue of the Chelonians, Rhynchocephalians and Crocodiles in the British Museum (Natural History)*. London (British Museum), x + 311 pp., 6 pls.

BROWN, A. E. 1908. Generic types of nearctic Reptilia and Amphibia. *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia*, vol. 60, pp. 112–127.

CARR, A. 1952. *Handbook of turtles*. Ithaca (Cornell Univ. Press), xv + 542 pp., 82 pls.

CONANT, R. 1958. *A field guide to reptiles and amphibians of the United States and Canada east of the 100th meridian*. Boston (Houghton Mifflin), xv + 366 pp., 40 pls.

COPE, E. D. 1868. An examination of the Reptilia and Batrachia obtained by the Orton Expedition to Equador and the Upper Amazon, with notes on other species. *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia*, for 1868, pp. 96–140.

ERNST, C. H. & BARBOUR, R. W. 1972. *Turtles of the United States*. Lexington (Univ. Kentucky Press), x + 347 pp., 24 pls.

FITZINGER, L. 1843. *Systema Reptilium*, fasc. 1, Amblyglossae. Vienna (Braumüller & Seidel), 106 pp.

FITZIMONS, V. F. 1932. Preliminary description of new forms of South African Reptilia and Amphibia from the Vernay-Lang Kalahari Expedition, 1930. *Ann. Transvaal Mus.*, vol. 15, pp. 35–40.

GMELIN, J. F. 1789. *Caroli a Linne . . . Systema Naturae . . .* ed. 13, vol. 1, pt. 3. Lipsiae, pp. 1033–1516.

GRANDIDIER, A. 1867. Liste des reptiles nouveaux découverts en 1866 sur la côte sud-ouest de Madagascar. *Rev. Mag. Zool.* (2), vol. 19, pp. 232–234.

GRAY, J. E. 1825. A synopsis of the genera of reptiles and Amphibia, with a description of some new species. *Ann. Philos.* (2) vol. 10, pp. 193–217.

——— 1831. *Synopsis Reptilium or short descriptions of the species of reptiles. I,*

Cataphracta, tortoises, crocodiles and enaliosaurians. London (Treuttel Wurtz), viii + 85 pp., 11 pls.

——— 1844. *Catalogue of the tortoises, crocodiles and amphisbaenians in the collection of the British Museum.* London (Brit. Mus.), viii + 80 pp.

——— 1855. *Catalogue of shield reptiles in the collection of the British Museum* I. Testudinata (tortoises). London (Brit. Mus.), 79 pp., 42 pls.

——— 1869. Notes on the families and genera of tortoises (Testudinata) and on the characters afforded by the study of their skulls. *Proc. zool. Soc. London* for 1869, pp. 165–225, pl. 15.

——— 1870. *Supplement to the catalogue of shield reptiles in the collection of the British Museum*, I. Testudinata (tortoises). London (Brit. Mus.), ix + 120 pp.

HEWITT, J. 1927. Further descriptions of reptiles and batrachians from South Africa. *Rec. Albany Mus.*, vol. 3, pp. 371–415, pls 20–24.

HOLBROOK, J. E. 1842. *North American herpetology*, 2nd. edit, vol. 1, Philadelphia (J. Dobson), xv + 152 pp., 24 pls.

LACEPEDE, B. G. E. DE 1788. *Histoire naturelle des quadrupèdes ovipares et des serpens*, vol. 1. Paris, 18 + 651 pp., 41 pls., 'Synopsis methodica'.

LATREILLE, P. A. 1801 in Sonnini & Latreille, *Histoire naturelle des reptiles*, vol. 1. Paris (Déterville), xii + 280 pp., pls.

LAURENT, R. F. 1956. Contribution ã l'herpétologie de la région des grands lacs de l'Afrique Centrale. *Ann. Mus. roy. Congo belge* (8vo), vol. 48, 190 pp., 21 pls.

——— 1965. A contribution to the knowledge of the genus *Pelusios* Wagler. *Ann Mus. roy. Afr. centr.* (8vo), Zool. vol. 135, 33 pp., 3 pls.

LINDHOLM, W. A. 1929. Rediviertes Verzeichniss der Gattungen der rezenten Schildkröten nebts Notizen zur Nomenklatur einiger Arten. *Zool. Anz.*, vol. 81, pp. 275–295.

LOVERIDGE, A. 1941. Revision of the African terrapins of the family Pelomedusidae. *Bull. Mus. comp. Zool. Harvard*, vol. 88 (6), pp. 465–524.

McDOWELL, S. B. 1964. Partition of the genus *Clemmys* and related problems in the taxonomy of the aquatic Testudinidae. *Proc. zool. Soc. London*, vol. 143, pp. 239–279.

MERREM, B. 1820. *Versuch eines Systems der Amphibien. Tentamen Systematis Amphibiorum.* Marburg (J. C. Krieger), xv + 191 pp., 2 pls.

MERTENS, R., MÜLLER, L. & RUST, H. T. 1934. Systematische Liste der lebenden Schildkröten. *Bl. Aquar.-und-Terrarienk.*, vol. 45 (3), pp. 42–45; (4), pp. 59–67.

MÜLLER, L. & HELLMICH, W. 1954. Zur Kenntnis einiger *Pelusios* Arten (Testudines). *Ver. zool. Stattssamml. München*, vol. 3, pp. 51–79, 2 pls.

POPE, C. A. 1939. *Turtles of the United States and Canada.* New York & London (A. A. Knopf), xviii + 343 pp. + v, 99 phot.

PRITCHARD, P. C. H. 1967. *Living turtles of the world.* Jersey City (TFH), 288 pp.

RAW, L. R. G. 1978. Taxonomic notes on the hinged terrapins, genus *Pelusios*, of Natal (Testudinata: Pelomedusidae). *Durban Mus. Nov.*, vol. 11 (17), pp. 287–294.

SCHOEPFF, J. D. 1792–1801. *Historia testudinum iconibus illustrata.* Erlangen (J. J. Palm), xii + 136 pp., 32 pls.

SCHMIDT, K. P. 1919. Contributions to the herpetology of the Belgian Congo, etc. *Bull. Amer. Mus. nat. Hist.*, vol. 39, pp. 385–624, pls 7–32.

——— 1953. *A checklist of North American amphibians and reptiles.* Chicago (Univ. Chicago Press), viii + 280 pp.

SCHWEIGGER, F. 1812. Prodromus monographiae cheloniorum. *Königsberger Arch. Naturwiss. Math.*, vol. 1, pp. 271–368, 406–462.
SIEBENROCK, F. 1909. Synopsis der rezenten Schildkröten mit Berücksichtigung der in historischer Zeit ausgestorbenen Arten. *Zool. Jahrb.*, Syst., Suppl. 10, pp. 427–618.
SMITH, M. A. 1931. *The fauna of British India, including Ceylon and Burma.* Reptilia and Amphibia I. Loricata, Testudines. London (Taylor & Francis), xxviii + 185 pp., 2 pls.
SPIX, J. B. DE 1824. *Animalia nova, sive species novae testudinium.* München, 24 pp.
STEJNEGER, L. 1902. Some generic names of turtles. *Proc. biol. Soc. Washington*, vol. 15, pp. 235–238.
——— 1923. Rehabilitation of a hitherto overlooked species of musk turtle of the southern states. *Proc. U.S. nat. Mus.*, vol. 62 (6), pp. 1–3.
——— & BARBOUR, T. 1917. *A checklist of North American amphibians and reptiles.* Cambridge (Harvard Univ. Press), iv + 125 pp.
STRAUCH, A. 1862. Chelonische Studien mit besonderer Berücksichtigung auf die Schildkröten Sammlung der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu St Petersburg. *Mem. Acad. imp. Sci.*, (7) vol. 5 (7), 196 pp., 1 pl.
SWAINSON, W. 1839. *On the natural history and classification of fishes, amphibians and reptiles, or monocardian animals.* II. London (Longman & Co.), i–vi, 452 pp.
TINKLE, D. W. 1958. The systematics and ecology of the *Sternothaerus carinatus* complex (Testudinata, Chelydridae). *Tulane Stud. Zool.*, vol. 6, pp. 3–56.
VILLIERS, A. 1958. *Initiations africaines, XV. Tortues et crocodiles de l'Afrique noire française.* Dakar (IFAN), 354 pp.
WAGLER, J. 1830. *Natürliches System der Amphibien*, etc. München, Stuttgart & Tübingen (Cotta), vi + 354 pp., 11 pls.
WERMUTH, H. & MERTENS, R. 1961. *Schildkröten, Krokodile, Brückenechsen.* Jena (G. Fischer), xxvi + 422 pp.
WRIGHT, A. H. & FUNKHOUSER, W. D. 1915. A biological reconnaissance of the Okefinokee Swamp in Georgia, I. Turtles, lizards and alligators. *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia*, vol. 67, pp. 107–139, pls 1–2.

GNATHODUS PANDER, 1856 (CONODONTA): NOTIFICATION OF A NEW PROPOSAL THAT *POLYGNATHUS BILINEATUS* ROUNDY, 1926 BE THE TYPE SPECIES OF THAT GENUS. Z.N.(S.) 2279

(see vol. 36, pp. 57–62, 201–202; vol. 37, p. 67; vol. 39, pp. 7–13)

By the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

As will be seen from the above list of references to the *Bulletin*, this case has aroused intense interest and widespread discussion. The basic issue remains: it is whether, in the interests of stability of nomenclature, the plenary powers should be used to designate a Lower Carboniferous species as type species of *Gnathodus* Pander, 1856; or whether Pander's originally monotypic type species, which is agreed to be inadequately figured and described, and of which the type material is lost, should be allowed to stand.

In an effort to provide evidence to help the Commission to reach a clear-cut decision on this case, I asked Professor Walter C. Sweet (*Ohio State University*), President of the Pander Society, to canvass the members of the Society (The Pander Society is the only international society for students of conodonts). In the Society's Newsletter No. 15, issued 16 August 1983, he briefly summarised the problem and then called for answers to the following questions:

'Which, if any, of the following solutions do you favour for the *Gnathodus* problem? If you have a solution that has not been suggested, please describe it in the space at the bottom of the page.

1. Restrict *Gnathodus* to *G. mosquensis* and assign Lower Carboniferous species to *Dryphenotus* (in other words, let the existing Rules apply; the concept of *Gnathodus* would be clarified only if the type specimens of *G. mosquensis* are found).
2. Set aside *G. mosquensis* Pander, 1856, as type species of *Gnathodus* and establish *G. texanus* Roundy, 1926 as type species. (This action would preserve the widely understood concept of *Gnathodus* based on Lower Carboniferous species).
3. Suppress both *Gnathodus* and *Dryphenotus* and set up two new names for the Lower and Upper Carboniferous species-groups they represent.
4. I have a completely different idea what should be done. My idea is as follows.

'By 1 December 1983, 235 members from 30 countries had responded to the general questionnaire and 124 (or 53%) participated in the *Gnathodus* discussion. In the latter group, preference is clearly for solution 2 above (86%), not only among the 61 persons who deal regularly with Carboniferous conodonts (85%), but also within the group of 63 persons who do not (87%).

'From comments submitted with questionnaires, it is obvious that the overwhelming support of Pander Society members for solution 2 above is based primarily on the fact that its implementation by the Commission would provide for stability in nomenclature and concept of a group of species that is important in Lower Carboniferous biostratigraphy, and would also prevent, at some time in the future, a revision of unknown scope in generic-level nomenclature for species commonly used in Upper Carboniferous biostratigraphy should the type specimens of Pander's *Gnathodus mosquensis* ever be located.

'Several members who work regularly with Lower Carboniferous conodont faunas, and who expressed general preference for solution 2, nevertheless questioned the wisdom of establishing *Gnathodus texanus* Roundy, 1926 as type species of *Gnathodus*. Those persons point out that the complete skeletal apparatus of *G. texanus* is unknown (or at least undescribed) and that the species is perhaps the least representative of the group that forms the basis of current concepts of *Gnathodus*. The lack of knowledge of the full skeletal apparatus of *G. texanus* makes it difficult at present to assess its relations to much better-known species such as *G. bilineatus* and *G. girtyi*, for which the complete apparatus is known.

'In summary, the Pander Society, acting as a "Committee of the Whole", expresses clear preference for solution 2 in the above-cited list, which is the proposal submitted to the Commission by Lane & Ziegler (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 57–62), largely on the objective and practical grounds that implementation of that proposal by the Commission will provide nomenclatural stability of nomenclature within a group of conodont species widely used in Carboniferous biostratigraphy.

'In considering the weight of the opinion expressed above, the Commission should be advised that the Pander Society represents some 250 students of conodonts in 30 countries and is the official working group on conodonts of the International Paleontological Association. Furthermore, tabulation of the results of the questionnaire on the "*Gnathodus* question" by country, continent, and area of specialization shows no significant difference, exhibits no geographic or political bias, and indicates to me that those members who were concerned with the question at all considered the alternatives strictly on their merits.' (Professor Sweet to Secretary, 16 December 1983).

Some explanation of the taxonomic considerations underlying the choice of a substitute type species for *Gnathodus* may be in order. From the first discovery of conodonts by Pander in 1856 until 1934, they were known only as isolated single skeletal elements of very diverse tooth-like forms. A large number of genera based on these elements were erected to contain, eventually, over 4,000 species.

From 1934 on there began to be collected specimens in which a number of skeletal elements occurred, apparently in a natural relationship to one another, and in most cases consisting of sets of markedly different elements that had been referred to different single-element genera. For a while these discoveries gave rise to a dual nomenclature in conodonts, but since 1966 a single apparatus-based nomenclature, applying the Law of Priority to single element-based names, has become universal. If, therefore, the Commission's decision in this case is to produce the desired stability of nomenclature, it is clearly desirable that so important a genus as *Gnathodus*, to which some 80, mainly Lower Carboniferous, species have been referred, should be based on a type species whose taxonomic position is secure by present-day criteria. This is not true of *G. texanus* Roundy, 1926, and still less so of *G. mosquensis* Pander, 1856. It is, however, true of *Polygnathus bilineatus* Roundy, 1926, a species now referred to *Gnathodus*.

Dr Ziegler and Dr Lane, the original applicants in this case, have just published in *Senckenbergiana Iethaea*, vol. 65, nos. 1–2, pp. 257–263, 1 pl., 1984, an illustrated account of a complete apparatus of *G. bilineatus* (Roundy) and propose that this, rather than *G. texanus* Roundy, should be designated as the type species of *Gnathodus*.

This entails the following changes to the formal proposals published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, p. 61:

in paragraph 10(1), for *Gnathodus texanus* Roundy, 1926, read *Polygnathus bilineatus* Roundy, 1926;

in paragraph 10(3), for *texanus* Roundy, 1926 as published in the binomen *Gnathodus texanus*, read *bilineatus* Roundy, 1926 as published in the binomen *Polygnathus bilineatus*.

CAECILIIDAE IN AMPHIBIA AND INSECTA (PSOCOPTERA): REPLY TO SMITH, LANHAM AND POLHEMUS. Z.N.(S.)2333

(see vol. 40, pp. 124–128; vol. 41, pp. 108–109)

By Thomas E. Moore (*University of Michigan, Museum of Zoology, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109–1079, U.S.A.*)

Ronald A. Nussbaum, Edward L. Mockford and I had considered and rejected the name CAECILIAIDAE because of its inherent difficulty in pronunciation,

because of its unexpected spelling and form, and because our recommended move follows normal priority. We had similarly rejected CAECILIUSIDAE. We still strongly favour our original proposal. Our choice of CAECILIONIDAE was based on priority, ease of pronunciation, ease of spelling, and ease of association with psocid names previously used under CAECILIIDAE. CAECILIONIDAE seems far more euphonious to us than CAECILIAIDAE or CAECILIUSIDAE. Psocids are not particularly widely or popularly discussed animals, the family-group names surrounding CAECILIIDAE have been in a state of flux between 1903 (first use) and 1978 (Mockford's summary of the usage of names), and only a relatively few authors have used this group name in insects; so very few would have to change their ways. We recognise here no special case based on usage or significance or probable confusion to justify not following the nomenclatural principle of priority. We hope our proposal will satisfy the preferences of most current herpetologists and entomologists, particularly specialists on psocids.

In case there are substantial numbers who think that it is too far-fetched to claim that the stem of *Caecilius*, for the purposes of Article 29, can ever be CAECILION-, we reluctantly suggest that *Caecilius* Curtis, 1837, be replaced by a junior synonym; and since we know of no such synonym in the literature, we hereby propose *Caecilionis* (arbitrary combination of letters; gender: masculine), type species *Caecilius fenestratus* Curtis, 1837, as a new replacement name. The stem of this name, for the purposes of Article 29, is CAECILION-. The generic name can only become nomenclaturally valid by the suppression of *Caecilius* Curtis, 1837, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy, and we add a request for the use of the plenary powers to that effect to our original proposals.

A COMMENT ON THE PROPOSAL TO DESIGNATE A NEOTYPE FOR *ADIANTHUS BUCATUS* AMEGHINO, 1891 (MAMMALIA) UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.) 2430

(see vol. 41, p. 56–57)

By Robert M. Schoch (*Division of Science, College of Basic Studies, Boston University, 871 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Mass., 02215 U.S.A.*)

Cifelli & Soria, 1984, propose that a hemimandible (Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales, Ameghino Collection no. 1812 = M.A.C.N. no. A1812) be designated the neotype of *Adianthus bucatus* Ameghino, 1891. They make this proposal explicitly in order to apply the name *Adianthus bucatus* Ameghino, 1891, to a species different from that to which this name was originally applied. I believe that their arguments and reasoning are of insufficient strength to warrant such a radical move by the Commission.

2. As Cifelli & Soria (1984, p. 56) admit, Ameghino's (1891, p. 134, fig. 31) description and figure of the original type specimen upon which the name *Adianthus bucatus* is based are adequate to recognise this distinct species and to make the name available. In the course of that original description of *Adianthus bucatus*, Ameghino also coined the name ADIANTHIDAE Ameghino, 1891, initially including only

the genus *Adianthus*. Furthermore, although the type specimen was probably lost during Ameghino's lifetime, Cifelli & Soria (1984, p. 57) admit that 'it is likely that additional materials pertaining to this species will be recovered when the fauna from which it is derived is better known'. In compliance with Article 75 of the Code, any neotype designated for *Adianthus bucatus* should be consistent with Ameghino's original 1891 description and illustration of the type specimen and, as nearly as practicable, come from the original type locality and geological horizon. Thus, it is logical to wait until more material of *Adianthus bucatus* is collected from the fauna from which it is derived and to designate one such future specimen the neotype.

3. In 1894 Ameghino described, and in 1897 figured, M.A.C.N. no. A1812 as a specimen of *Adianthus bucatus*. M.A.C.N. no. A1812 was collected from a different locality, and probably from a different geological horizon, than the type specimen of *Adianthus bucatus* (Cifelli & Soria, 1984). In the course of describing M.A.C.N. no. A1812 Ameghino, 1894, further diagnosed the family- level taxon ADIANTHIDAE Ameghino, 1891 (type-genus *Adianthus*). Ameghino later (1901) referred to M.A.C.N. no. A1812 in referring other genera and species to the ADIANTHIDAE.

4. Scott, 1910, and Soria, 1981, mistakenly took M.A.C.N. no. A1812 to be the type or neotype of *Adianthus bucatus*. However, Patterson, 1940, and Simpson & Minoprio, 1949, recognised and used Ameghino's original type of *Adianthus bucatus*, as figured and described by Ameghino in 1891, when dealing with this taxon. Thus, workers have not universally applied the name *Adianthus bucatus* to the same species. Sometimes it is applied to the species represented by Ameghino's 1891 original, and presumably lost, type and sometimes to the species represented by M.A.C.N. no. A1812.

5. *Adianthus bucatus* (and thus the ADIANTHIDAE) is usually considered a member of the South American ungulate order Litopterna (Simpson, 1945; Romer, 1966; Savage & Russell, 1983). Cifelli & Soria, 1984, make the otherwise unpublished, and thus to date unsubstantiated, claim that in actuality the original type specimen of *Adianthus bucatus* pertains to a caviomorph rodent, perhaps a dasyproctid or an erethizontid, whereas M.A.C.N. no. A1812 does indeed pertain to a litoptern as presumably do the other taxa that are usually referred to the ADIANTHIDAE. Thus, according to Cifelli & Soria, 1984, *Adianthus bucatus* must be removed from the Litopterna and placed in the Caviomorpha, a new generic and specific name must be coined for M.A.C.N. no. A1812, and a name other than ADIANTHIDAE must be applied to the family-level taxon containing the species represented by M.A.C.N. no. A1812. They argue that following this line of action will upset stability of nomenclature for the family-level taxon containing M.A.C.N. no. A1812, usually referred to as ADIANTHIDAE or ADIANTHINAE, and thus they propose that the name *Adianthus bucatus* be transferred to M.A.C.N. no. A1812 by designating this specimen the neotype of *Adianthus bucatus*.

6. It is unclear why Cifelli & Soria feel that the line of action they propose is in the best interest of nomenclatural stability. As they point out (and see paragraph 4 above), the name *Adianthus bucatus* has been applied to both the species represented by Ameghino's original 1891 type specimen and to the species represented by M.A.C.N. no. A1812. Further, it seems convenient for Cifelli & Soria that the original type specimen of *Adianthus bucatus* has been lost. If the name *Adianthus bucatus* is transferred to the species represented by M.A.C.N. no. A1812, then the species represented by Ameghino's original specimen will be left without a name and eventually will have to be renamed. Either way, a new generic and specific name will have to be proposed for one or the other species.

7. If the claims of Cifelli & Soria that *Adianthus bucatus* is a caviomorph rodent and M.A.C.N. no. A1812 is a litoptern are substantiated, then transferring the name *Adianthus bucatus* to M.A.C.N. no. A1812 will merely serve to superficially reify the mistaken notions of certain previous workers that *Adianthus bucatus* (as based on the original type specimen, as clearly indicated by Ameghino in his original 1891 publication, and not on M.A.C.N. no. A1812) is a litoptern. Yet confusion will remain in the older literature as the name *Adianthus bucatus* has not been universally applied to only one species. Such confusion cannot simply be cleared up by the designation of M.A.C.N. no. A1812 as the neotype of *Adianthus bucatus*. A more productive approach would encompass (1) publication of the revisionary work currently in progress (Cifelli & Soria, 1984) demonstrating that *Adianthus bucatus* (as based on the original type specimen) must be transferred to the Caviomorpha; (2) a published demonstration that M.A.C.N. no. A1812 does indeed pertain to the family-level taxon conceived and referred to by some workers previously as ADIANTHIDAE; (3) publication of a new name for the species represented by M.A.C.N. no. A1812; and (4) application of a family-level name other than ADIANTHIDAE to the family-level taxon containing the species represented by M.A.C.N. no. A1812. At the least, it would seem premature for the Commission to designate M.A.C.N. no. A1812 the neotype of *Adianthus bucatus* for the reasons given by Cifelli & Soria, 1984, before details of the revisionary work there alluded to are published and subjected to critical appraisal.

REFERENCES

AMEGHINO, F. 1891. Caracteres diagnósticos de cincuenta especies nuevas de mamiferos fósiles argentinos. *Rev. Argentina Hist. nat.* vol. 1, pp. 129–167.

——— 1894. Enumération synoptique des espèces de mammifères fossiles des formations éocènes de Patagonie. *Bol. acad. Nac. Cien. Córdoba* vol. 13, pp. 259–452.

——— 1897. Mammifères crétacés de l'Argentine. Deuxième contribution à la connaissance de la faune mammalogique des couches à *Pyrotherium*. *Bol. inst. Geogr. Argentino* vol. 18, pp. 406–521.

——— 1901. Notices préliminaires sur des ongulés nouveaux des terrains crétacés de Patagonie. *Bol. acad. Nac. Cien. Córdoba* vol. 16, pp. 349–426.

CIFELLI, R. L. & SORIA, M. F. 1984. *Adianthus bucatus* Ameghino, 1891 (Mammalia): proposed designation of a neotype under the plenary powers. *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 41, pt. 1, pp. 56–57.

PATTERSON, B. 1940. An adianthine litoptern from the Deseado formation of Patagonia. *Geol. ser. Field Mus. nat. Hist.* vol. 8, pp. 13–20.

ROMER, A. S. 1966. *Vertebrate Paleontology*. 3rd edn. Univ. Chicago Press, Chicago.

SAVAGE, D. E. & RUSSELL, D. E. 1983. *Mammalian Paleofaunas of the World*. Addison-Wesley Publ. Co., Reading, Massachusetts.

SCOTT, W. B. 1910. Mammalia of the Santa Cruz beds. Part 1. Litopterna. *Repts. Princeton Univ. Exped. Patagonia* vol. 7(1), pp. 1–156.

SIMPSON, G. G. 1945. The principles of classification and a classification of mammals. *Bull. Am. Mus. nat. Hist.* vol. 85, pp. 1–350.

SIMPSON, G. G. & MINOPRIO, J. L. 1949. A new adianthine litoptern and associated mammals from a Deseadan faunule in Mendoza, Argentina. *Am. Mus. Novitates* 1434, pp. 1–27.

SORIA, M. F. 1981. Los Litopterna del Colhuehuapense (Oligoceno tardio) de la Argentina. *Rev. Mus. Argentino Cien. nat.* vol. 3, pp. 1–54.

COMMENT ON THE APPLICATION CONCERNING *ATRACTOCERA LATIPES* MEIGEN, 1804.

Z.N.(S.) 2393

(see vol. 41, pp. 83–86. 86–93)

(1) By D. C. Currie (*Department of Entomology, Univeristy of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T8G 2E3*)

I wish to express my support for Dr Crosskey's request for alternative action to Dr Rubtsov's proposed conservation of *Atractocera latipes* Meigen, 1804 in its former, misidentified, sense.

The restriction by Crosskey & Davies, 1972, of the scope of the concept of *latipes* is a proper and necessary first step in the resolution of what is a large and taxonomically difficult species complex. Dr Rubtsov's contention that members of the complex have 'great medical and veterinary importance' is not supported by the literature. Indeed, I am not aware of a control programme ever having been directed against members of this complex. Dr Rubtsov's second contention, that the change of names introduces confusion, seems ill timed, as a new stability has been attained in the 12 years since Crosskey & Davies introduced the change. Only two workers (I. A. Rubtsov and L. Rivosecchi) have persisted in using the name *latipes* in the sense of Edwards, non Meigen, since the name change to *vernum* Macquart was made in 1972. On the other hand, virtually all taxonomic treatments dealing with members of the complex have followed the lead of Crosskey and Davies during the same interval.

In my opinion the action proposed by Dr Rubtsov is retrograde and would only result in unnecessary confusion.

(2) By T. K. Crosby (*Entomology Division, DSIR, Private Bag, Auckland, New Zealand*)

I support the proposal of Crosskey that the specific name *latipes* Meigen, 1804 should be interpreted by reference to the specimen recognized by Crosskey and Davies, 1972, as the holotype of the species. I do not support the proposal of Rubtsov that *latipes* should be interpreted in its former misidentified sense of Edwards, Rubtsov, and Davies.

OPINION 1277
PTILIUM GYLLENHAL, 1827 AND *PTENIDIUM* ERICHSON, 1845 (INSECTA, COLEOPTERA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) all fixations of type species hitherto made for *Ptilium* Gyllenhal, 1827 are hereby set aside and *Ptilium caesum* Erichson, 1845 is hereby designated as type species of that nominal genus;

(b) *Ptenidium* Erichson, 1845 is to be given nomenclatural precedence over *Anisarthria* Stephens, 1830, whenever the two names are considered to be synonyms;

(c) the specific name *pusillum* Gyllenhal, 1808, as published in the binomen *Scaphidium pusillum,* is to be given nomenclatural precedence over the specific name *melas* Marsham, 1802, as published in the binomen *Dermestes melas.*

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Ptilium* Gyllenhal, 1827 (gender: neuter), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) (a) above, *Ptilium caesum* Erichson, 1845 (Name Number 2216);

(b) *Ptenidium* Erichson, 1845 (gender: neuter), type species, by subsequent designation by Thomson, 1859, *Scaphidium pusillum* Gyllenhal, 1808, with an endorsement that it is to be given nomenclatural precedence over *Anisarthria* Stephens, 1830 whenever the two names are considered to be synonyms (Name Number 2217);

(c) *Anisarthria* Stephens, 1830 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Westwood, 1838, *Dermestes melas* Marsham 1802, with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over *Ptenidium* Erichson, 1845, whenever the two names are considered synonyms (Name Number 2218).

(3) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *caesum* Erichson, 1845, as published in the binomen *Ptilium caesum* (specific name of type species of *Ptilium* Gyllenhal, 1808) (Name Number 2898);

(b) *pusillum* Gyllenhal, 1808, as published in the binomen *Scaphidium pusillum* (specific name of type species of *Ptenidium* Erichson, 1845) with an endorsement that it is to be given nomenclatural precedence over the specific name *melas* Marsham, 1802, as published in the binomen *Dermestes melas,* whenever the two names are considered to be synonyms (Name Number 2899);

(c) *melas* Marsham, 1802, as published in the binomen *Dermestes melas* (specific name of type species of *Anisarthria* Stephens, 1830) with an endorsement that it is not to have priority over the specific name *pusillum* Gyllenhal, 1808, as published in the binomen *Scaphidium pusillum*, whenever the two names are considered synonyms (Name Number 2900).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2244

An application for the conservation of the generic names *Ptilium* Gyllenhal, 1827 and *Ptenidium* Erichson, 1845 was first received from Dr Hans Silfverberg (*University Zoological Museum, Helsinki*) on 29 December 1977. After an exchange of correspondence it was sent to the printer on 8 May 1979 and published on 25 October 1979 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 167–170. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and seven entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 6 July 1983 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (83)9 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 168–169. At the close of the voting period on 6 October 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — seventeen (17) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Willink, Mroczkowski, Hahn, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Bayer, Schuster, Uéno, Sabrosky, Binder, Ride, Dupuis, Halvorsen, Brinck, Corliss

Negative Votes — none (0).

Late affirmative votes were received from Cocks and Alvarado and a late negative vote from Heppell. Welch was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Kraus, Lehtinen and Savage.

Ride commented: 'I should prefer to see *Anisarthria* suppressed. It has remained an unused name for over 80 years. The relative precedence procedure should be used when there is a difference of opinion over a subjective synonymy, but not to keep an unused name alive with the added confusion of an inapplicable date.' (To have adopted this suggestion would have entailed publication of a note in the *Bulletin* and advertisement of a hitherto unannounced use of the plenary powers. In view of the delay that would have caused, it was decided to prepare the Opinion immediately. R.V.M.)

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Anisarthria Stephens, 1830, *Illustrations of British Entomology*, Mandibulata, vol. 3, p. 61

caesum, Ptilium, Erichson, 1845, *Naturgeschichte der Insekten Deutschlands,* vol. 3, p. 26

melas, Dermestes, Marsham, 1802, *Entomologia britannica,* p. 78

Ptenidium Erichson, 1845, *Naturgeschichte der Insekten Deutschlands,* vol. 3, p. 34

Ptilium Gyllenhal, 1827, *Insecta suecica,* part 4, p. 292

pusillum, Scaphidium, Gyllenhal, 1808, *Insecta suecica,* part 1, p. 189.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P. (83)9 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1277.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
7 June 1984

OPINION 1278
THE GENERIC NAME *RHINCODON* A. SMITH, 1829 (PISCES): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, the generic name *Rhiniodon* A. Smith, 1828, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy.

(2) The generic name *Rhincodon* A. Smith, 1829 (gender: masculine), type species, under Article 68b, *Rhiniodon typus* A. Smith, 1828, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2219.

(3) The specific name *typus* A. Smith, 1828, as published in the binomen *Rhiniodon typus* (specific name of type species of *Rhincodon* A. Smith, 1829) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2901.

(4) The family name RHINCODONTIDAE Müller & Henle, 1841 (as Rhinodontes, invalid under Article 32c(iii)) (type genus *Rhincodon* A. Smith, 1829) is hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Number 559.

(5) The generic name *Rhiniodon* A. Smith, 1828, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2141.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2090

An application for the conservation of the spelling *Rhincodon* of the generic name for the whale shark was first received from Dr C. Richard Robins and Dr Robert N. Lea (*University of Miami*) on 7 October 1974. It was sent to the printer on 19 November 1974 and published on 22 September 1975 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 32, pp. 163–167. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to five general serials and one ichthyological serial.

The application was opposed by Dr R. K. Brooke and Dr A. J. Bass (*Durban Museum, Durban, RSA*), (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 33, pp. 4–5), who drew attention to Smith's manuscript corrections in his own copies of Smith, 1828 of *Rhiniodon* to *Rhineodon* and *Rineodon*; and by the late Dr C. L. Hubbs (*Scripps Institute, La Jolla*), Dr L. J. V. Compagno (*Stanford University*) and Dr W. I. Follett (*California Academy of Sciences*), all in California (vol. 33, pp. 70–71). It was supported by Dr Camm Swift (*Los Angeles County Museum, California*) (vol. 34, pp. 67–68) and by Dr Alwyne Wheeler (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) (vol. 39, p. 6).

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 22 November 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1982)18 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, p. 6. At the close of the voting period on 22 February 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — fourteen (14) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Uéno, Schuster, Corliss, Halvorsen, Kraus, Brinck, Savage, Cocks, Starobogatov, Heppell, Ride

Negative Votes — six (6) received in the following order: Willink, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Cogger, Dupuis, Bayer.

Sabrosky abstained. Welch returned a late affirmative vote. No votes were returned by Alvarado, Bernardi, Binder and Lehtinen.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their votes:

Kraus: 'With regard to the established usage of *Rhincodon* since 1948 I vote for the proposal.'

Brinck: 'I was in some doubt after having read the application and the U.S. opponents, but Mr Wheeler's comments are to the point and good, and I vote for.'

Savage: 'I wish to change my vote to support this petition. I did not have access to the arguments of Robins & Lea when I first voted and was unduly influenced by the position of Hubbs, Compagno & Follett. This is clearly a case where *Rhincodon* has a very wide usage outside systematic ichthyology and it should be conserved.'

Hahn: 'I cannot confirm that in recent years *Rhincodon* is more widely used than other spellings. In six books published since 1960 I have found the following spellings:
Rhincodon twice (Grzimek's *Tierleben* and *Traité de Zoologie*)
Rhineodon three times (*Systema schywuschtschich*, German edition; Gilbert, *Sharks, skates and rays*; Norman, *Synopsis orders of fishes*)
Rhinocodon once (Herald, *Living fishes of the world*).
Therefore I cannot see a reason for the conservation of *Rhincodon* and vote against it.'

Dupuis: 'La seule proposition raisonnable est celle que Hubbs, Compagno & Follett appuyent sur l'étymologie. *Rhincodon* est à ce point dénué d'étymologie qu'aucun des vieux auteurs, qui savaient du grec, n'a songé — de Müller & Henle, 1841 à Günther 1870 — à introduire la lettre "c" dans les noms des taxa supragénériques fondés sur *Rhin(i)odon*.'

Cogger: 'Given the inconsistent usage of the names involved I accept the contention of Hubbs *et al.* that stability is best served by application of the Law of Priority.'

Bayer: 'Reaching a decision in this case has not been an easy matter. When names published in ephemera such as the *South African Commercial Advertiser* threaten predominant usage of names later published in bona

fide scientific journals, strict adherence to the principle of priority comes into serious question. In the present case, however, the usage that is threatened appears to be recent usage, dating from Bigelow & Schroeder's volume in *Fishes of the Western North Atlantic*, 1948, rather than the usage that has predominated overall. In view of Smith's statement (1828 fide Hubbs, Compagno & Follett, *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 33, p. 70) that the small teeth of the animal are arranged so as to resemble a file, it can hardly be doubted that when the typesetter of the *South African Commercial Advertiser* set *"Rhiniodon"* he misinterpreted as "i" the "e" of Smith's handwritten *"Rhineodon"*. Neither can it be seriously questioned that the typesetter of *Zool. Journ.* in 1829 similarly misinterpreted the same letter as "c", as pointed out by Gudger when he adopted Müller & Henle's spelling *Rhineodon* (Hubbs *et al.*, p. 71). As the spelling *Rhineodon* has apparently had more usage than *Rhincodon*; as the original author himself evidently had no clear preference for (or in any event no control over) any one spelling, as pointed out by Wheeler; as the name *Rhiniodon* has an obvious etymological relationship to a character of the animal mentioned in the original description and at the same time is closer in pronunciation to the predominating *Rhineodon*; and as there can in any case be little doubt as to what animal is meant by any of the permutations of spelling, it is better to let priority prevail here and revert to *Rhiniodon*.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Rhincodon A. Smith, 1829, *Zool. Journ.* vol. 4, pp. 433–434

RHINCODONTIDAE Müller & Henle, 1839, *Syst. Beschr. Plagiostomen*, Heft 2, p. 77

Rhiniodon A. Smith, 1828, *South African Commercial Advertiser*, vol. 3, no. 145, p. 2

typus, Rhiniodon, A. Smith, 1828, *South African Commercial Advertiser*, vol. 3, no. 145, p. 2.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(82)18 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1278.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
12 June 1984

OPINION 1279
CHRYSOLINA MOTSCHULSKY, 1860 (INSECTA, COLEOPTERA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers it is hereby ruled that the generic name *Chrysolina* Motschulsky, 1860, is to be given precedence over the generic name *Atechna* Chevrolat, 1837, whenever the two names are regarded as synonyms;

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the endorsements and Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Chrysomela* Linnaeus, 1758 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation of Latreille, 1810, *Chrysomela populi* Linnaeus, 1758 (Name Number 2220);

(b) *Chrysolina* Motschulsky, 1860 (gender: feminine), type species by original designation, *Chrysomela staphylaea* Linnaeus, 1758, with an endorsement that it is to be given precedence over *Atechna* Chevrolat, 1837, whenever the two names are regarded as synonyms (Name Number 2221);

(c) *Atechna* Chevrolat, 1837 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation of Chevrolat, 1843, *Chrysomela quatuordecimguttata* Fabricius, 1787, with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over *Chrysolina* Motschulsky, 1860, whenever the two names are regarded as synonyms (Name Number 2222);

(3) the following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the endorsements and Name Numbers specified:

(a) *populi* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Chrysomela populi* (specific name of the type species of *Chrysomela* Linnaeus, 1758) (Name Number 2902);

(b) *staphylaea* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Chrysomela staphylaea* (specific name of the type species of *Chrysolina* Motschulsky, 1806) (Name Number 2903);

(c) *duodecimguttata* Thunberg, 1787, as published in the binomen *Chrysomela duodecimguttata* (the valid name at the date of this ruling of the type species of *Atechna* Chevrolat, 1837) (Name Number 2904).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2291

An application for the conservation of *Chrysolina* Motschulsky, 1860 was first received from Dr Hans Silfverberg (*Zoological Museum of the University, Helsinki, Finland*) on 10 November 1978. After some correspondence, it was sent to the printer on 16 October 1979 and published on 8 May

1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 57–61. Public notice of the possible use of plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials and to nine general and seven entomological periodicals.

A comment was received from Dr J. R. Vockeroth and Dr L. Lesage (*Biosystematics Research Institute, Ottawa, Canada*) and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 13–14. A reply from Dr Silfverberg was received in which he accepted its correctness and the proposals were modified as mentioned in the same *Bulletin*. No other comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 12 March 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)1 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 59–60 and as modified in vol. 39, p. 14. At the close of the voting period on 12 June 1984, the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — nineteen (19) received in the following order: Melville, Cocks, Savage, Willink, Halvorsen, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Holthuis, Binder, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Hahn, Corliss, Alvarado, Bayer, Uéno, Kraus, Heppell, Dupuis

Negative Votes — four (4): Schuster, Cogger, Ride, Lehtinen.

No votes were returned by Bernardi and Sabrosky.

Dr P. T. Lehtinen commented: 'The proposal should be withdrawn. The tasks of the Commission do not include prognostic judgement of obscure cases. The proposal does not list any reference directly placing *Atechna duodecimguttata* (Thunberg, 1758) and *Chrysolina staphylaea* (Linné, 1758), the type species of the genera involved, into the same genus by taxonomic argumentation. The generic affiliation of the "South African species of *Chrysomela* s. lat" seems not to be clarified, at least not according to information afforded in the proposal.'

Dr Silfverberg replied: 'I do not understand the reason behind the objection. I gave a reference to Bechyné, 1950, where the two groups in question are included in the same genus. As for prognostic judgment, my intention is to make sure that the name of the large and important, mainly palaearctic, genus does not depend on what status is given to the South African group (as I mentioned, Maulik in 1925 treated it as a separate genus). I did not ask the Commission to make a taxonomic statement, but to give *Chrysolina* nomenclatural precedence over *Atechna*. I can give an additional reference where *Atechna* is listed as a subgenus of *Chrysolina* with *C. duodecimguttata* (Thunb.) given as type species of *Atechna*. It is Daccordi, M., 1980, I sottogeneri afrotropicali di *Chrysolina* con descrizione di una nuova specie (Coleoptera Chrysomelidae), *Rev. Zool Afr.* vol. 94, pp. 299–310. I hope this explains anything that was previously not clear. I am sure nobody would wish to throw the name *Chrysolina* into confusion.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling giving in the present Opinion:

Atechna Chevrolat, 1837, in Dejean, J. A., *Catalogue des Coléoptères de la collection de M. le Comte Dejean.* (edn. 3). Paris, p. 427

Chrysolina Motschulsky, 1860, *Schrenck's Reisen und Forschungen im Amur-Lande*, vol. 2, p. 210

Chrysomela Linnaeus, 1758, *Systema Naturae* (ed. 10), vol. 1, p. 368

duodecimguttata, Chrysomela, Thunberg, 1787, *Mus. Nat. Acad. Upsaliensis*, part 4, p. 44

populi, Chrysomela, Linnaeus, 1758. *Systema Naturae* (ed. 10), vol. 1, p. 370

staphylaea, Chrysomela, Linnaeus, 1758, *Systema Naturae* (ed. 10), vol. 1, p. 370.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)1 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion 1279.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
26 June 1984

OPINION 1280
RAFINESQUE, C.S., 1822 'ON THE TURTLES OF THE UNITED STATES': SUPPRESSED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, the work by C. S. Rafinesque, 1822, 'On the turtles of the United States', *Kentucky Gazette* (n.s. 1), vol. 36, no. 21, 23 May, is hereby suppressed and it is hereby ruled that no name acquires the status of availability by reason of having been published therein.

(2) The title of the work suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoology with the title number 88.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2289

An application for Rafinesque's 1822 newspaper article 'On the turtles of the United States' to be suppressed was received in June 1979 from Professor Hobart M. Smith, Dr David Chiszar and Mrs Rozella B. Smith (*University of Colorado*). It was sent to the printer on 1 August 1979 and published on 8 May 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 53–56. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and to two herpetological serials. A comment by Professor Dr L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden*) was replied to by the senior applicant and published, with a further comment from Mr A. F. Stimson (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 236–237. These comments discussed the proposition that Rafinesque's English (not North American Indian) vernacular names, which were descriptive, could or could not serve as descriptions or indications in the meaning of the Code. They did not affect the substance of the case.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 12 March 1984 the members of the Commission were asked to vote under the Three-Month Rule in Voting Paper (1984)2 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 56. At the close of the voting period on 12 June 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-two (22) received in the following order: Melville, Savage, Cocks, Willink, Halvorsen, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Holthuis, Binder, Mroczkowski, Hahn, Corliss, Brinck, Alvarado, Bayer, Schuster, Uéno, Cogger, Kraus, Ride, Heppell, Lehtinen

Negative Vote — Dupuis

No votes were returned by Bernardi and Sabrosky.

The following comments were returned by members of the

Commission with their voting papers:

Holthuis: 'To suppress a work because one name in it threatens stability of nomenclature seems like using a cannon to kill a fly. I vote for, because I must protest against Mr Stimson's reasoning that a vernacular name may be accepted as a description. This certainly is not and never has been the intention of the Code, and to accept his reasoning as correct would cause many instances of nomenclatural confusion.'

Bayer: 'The key to the status of at least 10 of the 12 names proposed by Rafinesque, 1822, was succinctly stated by Stimson (vol. 38, p. 236). The vernacular names associated with the species involved are quite evidently not aboriginal vernaculars (which may or may not be descriptive) but descriptive phrases applied as common names by Rafinesque himself. All but two (Fighting Tarapen and Biting Tarapen) convey objective characters (colour pattern, sculpture, nature of claws, etc) and it seems to me that they can only be interpreted as descriptive. The only safe way to avoid future difficulties is to suppress the work as a whole.'

Heppell: 'I think the general point raised as to whether a vernacular name can constitute a description (as distinct from an indication) is of sufficient importance that the Commission should make this unambiguous in the Code. It should also be made clear whether the mention of weight or dimensions alone is acceptable as a description (for nomenclatural purposes) in the absence of other stated characters [I would be opposed to either of these suggestions].'

Dupuis: 'Je m'oppose, par principe, à toute suppression d'ouvrage, et plus encore d'un ouvrage qui, réimprimé, n'en devient que plus accessible! Je vote, donc, contre la proposition originale. Je ne serais pas opposé, par contre, à la suppression de tel ou tel des noms inclus dans l'ouvrage.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCE

The original reference to the work suppressed by the ruling given in the present Opinion is that given in paragraph (1) of the Ruling.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast in V.P.(84)2 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1280.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
26 June 1984

OPINION 1281
ACMAEA LIMATULA CARPENTER, 1864 (MOLLUSCA, GASTROPODA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, the specific name *mamillata* Reeve, 1855, as published in the binomen *Patella mamillata*, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy.

(2) The specific name *limatula* Carpenter, 1864, as published in the binomen *Acmaea limatula*, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2905.

(3) The specific name *mamillata* Reeve, 1855, as published in the binomen *Patella mamillata*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1134.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2268

An application for the conservation of *Acmaea limatula* Carpenter, 1864 was first received from Dr David R. Lindberg (*California Academy of Sciences*) on 30 June 1978. It was sent to the printer on 3 July 1979 and published on 8 May 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 51–52. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and three malacological serials. The application was supported by Dr Barry Roth (*California Academy of Sciences*). No adverse comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 12 March 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule in Voting Paper (1984)3 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 52. At the close of the voting period on 12 June 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-three (23) received in the following order: Melville, Savage, Cocks, Willink, Halvorsen, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Holthuis, Binder, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Hahn, Corliss, Alvarado, Bayer, Schuster, Uéno, Cogger, Kraus, Ride, Heppell, Lehtinen, Dupuis

Negative Votes — none (0).

No votes were returned by Bernardi and Sabrosky.

Hahn commented: 'If, as I suppose, *Patella mamillata* and *Acmaea limatula* are subjective synonyms, I should have preferred to use the relative precedence procedure.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

limatula, Acmaea, Carpenter, 1864, *Rep. brit. Assoc. Adv. Sci.* for 1863, p. 650

mamillata, Patella, Reeve, 1855, *Conchol. icon.*, vol. 8, species 140.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)3 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1281.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
26 June 1984

OPINION 1282
PANOPEUS H. MILNE EDWARDS, 1834 (CRUSTACEA, DECAPODA): DESIGNATION OF TYPE SPECIES

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, all designations of type species for the nominal genus *Panopeus* H. Milne Edwards hitherto made are hereby set aside and *Panopeus herbstii* H. Milne Edwards, 1834, is hereby designated as the type species of that genus.

(2) The generic name *Panopeus* H. Milne Edwards, 1834 (gender: masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Panopeus herbstii* H. Milne Edwards, 1834, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2223.

(3) The specific name *herbstii* H. Milne Edwards, 1834, as published in the binomen *Panopeus herbstii*, and as interpreted by reference to the lectotype designated by Holthuis, 1979, *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, p. 159 (specific name of type species of *Panopeus* H. Milne Edwards, 1834) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2906.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2236

An application for the designation of a type species for the genus *Panopeus* H. Milne Edwards, 1834 (a genus based on a misidentified type species) was first received from Professor Dr L. B. Holthuis (*Rikjsmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden*) on 10 October 1977. It was sent to the printer on 12 April 1979 and published on 25 October 1979 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 158–160. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Builetin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and one specialised serial.

An objection by Dr Kerzhner (*Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad*) that *Panopeus herbstii* should have been treated as a new replacement name for *Cancer panope* Herbst, 1801, was rebutted by Dr Holthuis (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 161–162). No other comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 12 March 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)6 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, p. 160. At the close of the voting period on 12 June 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-one (21) received in the following order: Melville, Cocks, Savage, Willink, Halvorsen, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov,

Mroczkowski, Binder, Hahn, Corliss, Brinck, Alvarado, Bayer, Schuster, Uéno, Cogger, Kraus, Ride, Heppell, Dupuis

Negative Vote — one (1): Lehtinen. Holthuis abstained from voting.

No votes were returned by Bernardi and Sabrosky.

Dupuis commented: 'L'argumentation de Kerzhner est trés intéressante et pourrait être excellement défendue (n'était le formalisme et la définition hélas orthographique et non pas étymologique de l'homonymie — donc de la tautonymie — dans le Code) à l'aide de l'Article 68d qui traite du type par tautonymie absolue. Ce point de droit rappelé, il ne paraît pas souhaitable, en pratique (c'est à dire du point de vue de l'usage) — et d'ailleurs Kerzhner ne le souhaite pas — que *panope* demeure, conformement à la désignation de Desmarest, le type de *Panopeus*. Je vote, donc, en faveur du lectotype désigné par Holthuis pour *herbstii* et de la désignation de cette espèce come type du genre *Panopeus*.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

herbstii, Panopeus, H. Milne Edwards, 1834, *Hist. nat. Crustacés*, vol. 1, p. 403

Panopeus H. Milne Edwards, 1834, *Hist. nat. Crustacés*, vol. 1, p. 403.

The following is the original reference to a lectotype designation ratified by the ruling given in the present Opinion: of the original of Say, 1817, *J. Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia*, vol. 1 (1), pl. 4, fig. 3 as lectotype of *Panopeus herbstii* H. Milne Edwards, 1834, by Holthuis, 1979, *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, p. 159.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)6 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1282.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
26 June 1984

OPINION 1283
LYMANTRIIDAE HAMPSON, [1893] GIVEN NOMENCLATURAL PRECEDENCE OVER ORGYIIDAE WALLENGREN, 1861 AND DASYCHIRIDAE PACKARD, 1864 (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA)

(1) RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers it is hereby ruled that the family-group name LYMANTRIIDAE Hampson, [1893] (type genus *Lymantria* Hübner, [1819]) is to be given precedence over the family-group names ORGYIIDAE Wallengren, 1861 (type genus *Orgyia* Ochsenheimer, 1810) and DASYCHIRIDAE Packard, 1864 (type genus *Dasychira* Hübner,]1809[) when applied to the same biological taxon at any level in the family group.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Lymantria* Hübner, [1819] (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Moore, [1833], *Phalaena monacha* Linnaeus, 1758 (Name Number 2224);

(b) *Orgyia* Ochsenheimer, 1810 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Curtis, 1831, *Phalaena antiqua* Linnaeus 1758 (Name Number 2225);

(c) *Dasychira* Hübner, [1809] (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Dasychira tephra* Hübner, [1809] (Name Number 2226);

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *monacha* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Phalaena monacha* (specific name of type species of *Lymantria* Hübner, [1819]) (Name Number 2907);

(b) *antiqua* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Phalaena antiqua* (specific name of type species of *Orgyia* Ochsenheimer, 1810) (Name Number 2908);

(c) *tephra* Hübner, [1809], as published in the binomen *Dasychira tephra* (specific name of type species of *Dasychira* Hübner, [1809]) (Name Number 2909).

(4) The following family-group names are hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) LYMANTRIIDAE Hampson, [1893] (type genus *Lymantria* Hübner, [1819], with an endorsement that it is to be given precedence over ORGYIIDAE Wallengren, 1861 and over DASYCHIRIDAE Packard, 1864 when applied to the same family-group taxon at any level in the family group (Name Number 560);

(b) ORGYIIDAE Wallengren, 1861 (type genus *Orgyia* Ochsenheimer, 1810) with an endorsement that it is not to be used in preference to LYMANTRIIDAE Hampson, [1893] when applied to the same family-group taxon at any level in the family group (Name Number 561);

(c) DASYCHIRIDAE Packard, 1864 (type genus *Dasychira* Hübner, [1809], with an endorsement that it is not to be used in preference to LYMANTRIIDAE Hampson, [1893] when applied to the same family-group taxon at any level in the family group (Name Number 562).

(5) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Laria* Schrank, 1802, a junior homonym of *Laria* Scopoli, 1763 (Name Number 2142);

(b) *Liparis* Ochsenheimer, 1810, a junior homonym of *Liparis* Scopoli, 1777 (Name Number 2143).

(6) The following family-group names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) LARIIDAE Newman, 1832 (as 'Lariae'), invalid because the name of its type genus is a junior homonym (Name Number 498);

(b) LIPARIDAE Boisduval, 1834 (as 'Liparides'), invalid because the name of its type genus is a junior homonym (Name Number 499).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2216

An application for the grant of nomenclatural precedence to the family name LYMANTRIIDAE Hampson [1893] over two senior synonyms was first received from Dr I. W. B. Nye, Dr D. S. Fletcher (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) and Dr D. C. Ferguson (*Systematic Entomology Laboratory USDA, c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington D.C. 20560, U.S.A.*) on 14 February 1977. It was accompanied by statements in support by Dr I. F. B. Common (*CSIRO Division of Entomology, Canberra, Australia*), Dr U. Dall'Asta (*Musée royal de l'Afrique centrale, Tervuren, Belgium*), Dr G. Ebert (*Landessammlungen für Naturkunde, D75 Karlsruhe 1, BRD*), Dr H. Inoue (*Biological Laboratory, Otsuma Women's University, Tokyo, Japan*), Dr E. G. C. Pinhey (*National Museum, Bulawayo, Zimbabwe*) and Dr J. C. E. Riotte (*Bernice P. Bishop Museum, Honolulu, Hawaii*). The application was sent to the printer on 9 October 1979 and published on 8 May 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 40–48. While it was passing through the press additional expressions of support were received from Dr L. Vari (*Transvaal Museum, RSA*) and Dr P. Viette (*Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Paris*).

Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and eight entomological serials. No further comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 12 March 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule in Voting Paper (1984)8 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 42–44. At the close of the voting period on 12 June 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-three (23) received in the following order: Melville, Savage, Cocks, Willink, Halvorsen, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Holthuis, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Binder, Hahn, Corliss, Alvarado, Bayer, Schuster, Uéno, Cogger, Kraus, Ride, Heppell, Lehtinen, Dupuis

Negative Votes — none (0).

No votes were returned by Bernardi and Sabrosky.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and Official Indexes by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

antiqua, Phalaena, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 503

Dasychira Hübner, [1809], *Samml. exot. Schmett.*, vol. 1, pl. [178]

DASYCHIRIDAE Packard, 1864, *Proc. entomol. Soc. Philadelphia*, vol. 3, p. 331

Laria Schrank, 1802, *Fauna Boica* vol. 2 (2), p. 150

Lariae Newman, 1832, *Sphinx vespiformis: an essay*, table facing p. 31, pp. 40, 44

Liparis Ochsenheimer, 1810, *Schmett. Europas*, vol. 3, p. 186

Lymantria Hübner, [1819], *Verz. bekannter Schmett.*, (9)–(11), p. 160

LYMANTRIIDAE Hampson, [1893], *Fauna British India*, Moths, vol. 1, p. 432

monacha, Phalaena, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 501

Orgyia Ochsenheimer, 1810, *Schmett. Europas*, vol. 3, p. 208

ORGYIIDAE Wallengren, 1861, *K. svenska Fregattes Eugenies Resa. C.A. Virgin åren, 1851–1853*, (Zool.) vol. 1, (10, Lepidoptera), p. 369

tephra, Dasychira, Hübner, [1809], *Samml. exot. Schmett.*, vol. 1, pl. [178].

The following are the original references to type-species designations accepted in the present Opinion: of *Phalaena monacha* Linnaeus, 1758 as type species of *Lymantria* Hübner, [1819] by Moore, [1883], *Lepid. Ceylon*, vol. 2, p. 99; of *Phalaena antiqua* Linnaeus, 1758 as type species of *Orgyia* Ochsenheimer, 1810 by Curtis, 1831, *British Entomol.*, vol. 8, p. 378.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)8 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1283.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
27 June 1984

OPINION 1284
PEGGICHISME KIRKALDY, 1904 (HEMIPTERA, HETEROPTERA): DESIGNATION OF TYPE SPECIES

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, all designations of type species for the nominal genus *Peggichisme* Kirkaldy, 1904 hitherto made are hereby set aside and the nominal species *Davila consanguineus* [sic] Distant, 1893, is hereby designated as type species of that genus.

(2) The generic name *Peggichisme* Kirkaldy, 1904 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Davila consanguinea* Distant, 1893, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2227.

(3) The specific name *consanguinea* Distant, 1893, as published in the binomen *Davila consanguineus* [sic] (specific name of type species of *Peggichisme* Kirkaldy, 1904) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2910.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2197

An application for the use of the plenary powers to designate a type species for *Peggichisme* Kirkaldy, 1904 was first received from Dr Merrill H. Sweet (*Texas A & M University*) on 7 September 1976. It was sent to the printer on 3 July 1979 and published on 8 May 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 37–39. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and seven entomological serials. Support was received from Professor L. B. Holthuis. No adverse comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 12 March 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month rule in Voting Paper (1984)9 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 39. At the close of the voting period on 12 June 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-three (23) received in the following order: Melville, Savage, Cocks, Willink, Halvorsen, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Holthuis, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Binder, Hahn, Corliss, Alvarado, Bayer, Schuster, Uéno, Cogger, Kraus, Ride, Heppell, Lehtinen, Dupuis

Negative Votes — none (0).

No votes were returned by Bernardi and Sabrosky.

The following comments were returned by members of the

Commission with their voting papers:

Ride: 'Why are we asked to conserve "*consanguineus* [sic]" on the Official List? If *Davila* is feminine, it is mandatory to correct the specific name.' [This has been done. R.V.M.].

Heppell: 'It is possible that Distant and Gray both named *Davila* after Don Pedro Francisco Davila and for that reason regarded it as masculine.'

Dupuis: 'S'agissant d'un simple cas d'espèce-type mal identifiée, je vote en principe pour. Malheureusement, le Code, Appendice D, I, 9, n'apprécie pas beaucoup les noms susceptibles d'une prononciation "comique" et, selon Mayr, Linsley & Usinger (1953, p. 262) "ridiculous names involving a play on words, such as Kirkaldy's (1904) *Peggichisme* (pronounced Peggy kiss me) . . . were condemned by the Zoological Society of London". J'ose espérer que cette grave question ne sera pas soulevée.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

consanguinea, Davila, Distant, 1893, *Biol. centr.-Amer.*, Heteroptera, vol. 1. Suppl., p. 395

Peggichisme Kirkaldy, 1904, *Entomologist*, vol. 37, p. 280.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P. (84)9 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1284.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
5 July 1984

OPINION 1285
BARBUS ALTIANALIS BOULENGER, 1900 AND *B. RUEPPELLI* BOULENGER, 1902 (PISCES, CYPRINIDAE): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers the specific name *rueppellii* Pfeffer, 1896, as published in the binomen *Labeo rueppellii*, and all uses of that name prior to the publication of *Barbus rueppelli* by Boulenger, 1902, are hereby suppressed for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy.

(2) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *altianalis* Boulenger, 1900, as published in the binomen *Barbus altianalis* (Name Number 2911);

(b) *rueppelli* Boulenger, 1902, as published in the binomen *Barbus rueppelli* (Name Number 2912).

(3) The specific name *rueppellii* Pfeffer, 1896, as published in the binomen *Labeo rueppellii*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1135.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2164

An application for the conservation of *Barbus altianalis* Boulenger, 1900 and *B. rueppelli* Boulenger, 1902 was first received from Dr Gordon McG. Reid on 2 February 1976. It was sent to the printer on 1 August 1979 and printed on 18 February 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 249–251. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials and to seven general and three ichthyological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 12 March 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule in Voting Paper (84)10 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, p. 250. At the close of the voting period on 12 June 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-one (21) received in the following order: Melville, Savage, Cocks, Willink, Schuster, Halvorsen, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Holthuis, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Binder, Corliss, Alvarado, Bayer, Uéno, Cogger, Kraus, Ride, Heppell, Lehtinen

Negative Votes — two (2): Hahn, Dupuis.

No voting papers were returned by Bernardi and Sabrosky.

The following comments were sent in by members of the

Commission with their voting papers:

Hahn: 'I vote against because the problem is not presented clearly enough. On p. 249 it is said that there is no doubt that the holotypes of *L. rueppellii* and *B. altianalis* are conspecific, but on p. 250 it is shown that they belong to different subspecies: *rueppellii rueppellii* = *altianalis radcliffii* and *altianalis altianalis* = *rueppellii altianalis*. It cannot be excluded that some author will treat them as different species and therefore the relative precedence procedure would have been preferable. Moreover, it is not clearly stated why *Barbus rueppelli* Boulanger, 1902 should be conserved.'

Dupuis: 'De l'avis du requérant "the name *Barbus rueppelli* Boulenger is of uncertain status in the present state of knowledge of this group". Ceci illustre les difficultés bien connues de l'étude populationnelle et biogéographique des poissons des lacs africains. Il me parait donc assez contradictoire, ou en tout cas prématuré, de vouloir trancher en termes de nomenclature un problème taxinomique qui peut réserver des surprises.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

altianalis, Barbus, Boulenger, 1900, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (7) vol. 6, p. 159

rueppelli, Barbus, Boulenger, 1902, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (7) vol. 10, pp. 423, 427, 428

rueppelii, Labeo, Pfeffer, 1896, Die Fische Ost-Afrikas in *Die Thierwelt Deutsch-ost-Afrikas u.d. Nachbargebiete* (3), pp. 51–52.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes on V.P. (84)10 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1285.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
5 July 1984

OPINION 1286
CHERMES FUSCA ZETTERSTEDT, 1828 (INSECTA, HOMOPTERA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers it is hereby ruled that the specific name *fusca* Geoffroy in Fourcroy, 1785, as published in the binomen *Psylla fusca*, is not to be used in preference to the specific name *fusca* Zetterstedt, 1828, as published in the binomen *Chermes fusca*, whenever those names are combined with the generic name *Psylla* Geoffroy, 1762.

(2) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *fusca* Zetterstedt, 1828, as published in the binomen *Chermes fusca*, with an endorsement that it is to be preferred to the specific name *fusca* Geoffroy in Fourcroy, 1785, as published in the binomen *Psylla fusca*, whenever those names are combined with the generic name *Psylla* Geoffroy, 1762 (Name Number 2913);

(b) *fusca* Geoffroy in Fourcroy, 1785, as published in the binomen *Psylla fusca*, with an endorsement that it is not to be used in preference to the specific name *fusca* Zetterstedt, 1828, as published in the binomen *Chermes fusca*, whenever those names are combined with the generic name *Psylla* Geoffroy, 1762 (Name Number 2914).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2149

An application for the conservation of *Psylla fusca* Zetterstedt, 1828, through the suppression of *Psylla fusca* Geoffroy in Fourcroy, 1785 was first received from Dr Pavel Lauterer (*Moravske Museum, Brno, Czechoslovakia*) 18 September 1975. In correspondence with Dr Lauterer it was pointed out that *Psylla fusca*, being a nomen dubium, was not suitable for suppression on that ground alone; and that the homonymy involved being secondary, and thus subjectively based, the alternative option of the relative precedence procedure might be considered. Dr Lauterer agreed to this suggestion. His paper was sent to the printer on 23 January 1980 and published on 25 September 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 159–162. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and seven entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 12 March 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)11 for or against

the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 160. At the close of the voting period on 12 June 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-one (21) received in the following order: Melville, Cocks, Savage, Willink, Schuster, Halvorsen, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Holthuis, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Binder, Hahn, Corliss, Alvarado, Bayer, Uéno, Cogger, Kraus, Lehtinen, Dupuis

Negative Votes — two (2): Ride, Heppell.

No votes were returned by Bernardi and Sabrosky.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Holthuis: 'I am unhappy with the wording of paragraph 6(1) of the application. Even if *fusca* Fourcroy in Geoffroy is not used, as long as it remains an available name *Psylla fusca* Geoffroy remains a senior homonym of *Psylla fusca* (Zetterstedt). Would it therefore not be better to suppress *Psylla fusca* Geoffroy, 1785 and all its uses before the publication of Zetterstedt's name, for the purposes of both priority and homonymy? The loss of *Psylla fusca* Geoffroy cannot be very serious, and it has a junior objective synonym in *Chermes castanea* Gmelin, 1789.

'Another solution would be (but I cannot judge its taxonomic merits) to designate as neotype of *Psylla fusca* Geoffroy a specimen that does not belong to the genus *Psylla* as now understood. This would remove *Psylla fusca* Geoffroy from *Psylla* and the name then ceases to be a threat to its junior secondary homonym, *Psylla fusca* (Zetterstedt).'

Ride: '*Psylla fusca* Geoffroy, 1785 is a forgotten name and its use is contrary to the purpose of the Law of Priority (Article 23 a–b). No case is made to preserve it. The Commission should be asked to suppress it under the plenary powers, as appears to have been Lauterer's original intention.' [No evidence has been presented to show that *Psylla fusca* Geoffroy, 1785 is a senior synonym of a name in general current use. R.V.M.].

Heppell: 'To place *Psylla fusca* Geoffroy on the Official List makes a mockery of that list. From the applicant's evidence that taxon is either (a) completely unidentifiable, in which case its name can be suppressed without loss, or (b) not a *Psylla* and probably not even an homopteran, in which case *Psylla fusca* (Zetterstedt) is not a secondary homonym under the revised homonymy rules adopted at Monaco. I sympathize with the applicant's wish to conserve *Psylla fusca* (Zetterstedt) but feel that he has been ill advised on the method chosen to achieve this result.' [Unfortunately for this argument, *Psylla fusca* (Zetterstedt) had been replaced as a junior secondary homonym before 1961 by *Psylla perspicillata* Flor, 1861. R.V.M.]

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

fusca, Chermes, Zetterstedt, 1828, *Fauna Insectorum lapponica,* p. 552

fusca, Psylla, Geoffroy in Fourcroy, 1785, *Entomologia parisiensis, sive catalogus insectorum qui in agro parisiensi reperiuntur*, p. 224.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P. (84)11 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1286.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
11 July 1984

OPINION 1287
SESIA ANDRENAEFORMIS LASPEYRES, 1801 (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers the specific name *anthraciniformis* Esper, 1798, as published in the binomen *Sphinx anthraciniformis*, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy.

(2) The specific name *andrenaeformis* Laspeyres, 1801, as published in the binomen *Sesia andrenaeformis*, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2915.

(3) The specific name *anthraciniformis* Esper, 1798, as published in the binomen *Sphinx anthraciniformis*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1136.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2139

An application for the conservation of *Sesia andrenaeformis* Laspeyres, 1801, was first received from Dr N. P. Kristensen (*Universitetets zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen*) on 1 August 1975. It was sent to the printer on 15 April 1980 and published on 25 September 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 156–158. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin*, as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and eight entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 12 March 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)12 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 157. At the close of the voting period on 12 June 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty (20) received in the following order: Melville, Savage, Cocks, Willink, Schuster, Halvorsen, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Holthuis, Brinck, Binder, Corliss, Alvarado, Bayer, Uéno, Kraus, Ride, Heppell, Lehtinen, Mroczkowski

Negative Votes — two (2): Hahn, Cogger.

Dupuis abstained. No votes were returned by Bernardi and Sabrosky.

Hahn commented: 'Important details are missing here: are *anthraciniformis* and *andrenaeformis* objective or subjective synonyms, are their types preserved and, following this, should the relative precedence procedure not have been better used? These things are not clear, and so I vote against.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

andrenaeformis, Sesia, Laspeyres, 1801, *Sesiae europaeae iconibus et descriptionibus illustratae*, p. 20

anthraciniformis, Sphinx, Esper, 1799, *Die Schmetterlinge in Abbildungen nach der Natur mit Beschreibungen*, Suppl. Bd. (2 Abschnitt), Abendschmett., p. 29.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P. (64)12 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion Number 1287.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
11 July 1984

THRESKIORNITHIDAE RICHMOND, 1917 (AVES): APPLICATION TO PLACE ON OFFICIAL LIST OF FAMILY-GROUP NAMES IN ZOOLOGY AND TO GIVE PRECEDENCE OVER PLATALEINAE BONAPARTE, 1838, AND OTHER COMPETING FAMILY-GROUP NAMES. Z.N.(S.)2136

By the late E. Eisenmann (*American Museum of Natural History, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.*), E. Mayr (*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*), and K. C. Parkes (*Carnegie Museum of Natural History, Pittsburgh, Pa., U.S.A.*)

The family-group name THRESKIORNITHIDAE and the subfamily name THRESKIORNITHINAE for the typical ibises (17 genera and about 27 species) are today in general (almost universal) use for the birds well-known in English as ibises (French: ibis; German: Ibisse). This application is submitted, in accordance with Code Art. 23d(ii), because an earlier family-group name, PLATALEIDAE, based on PLATALEINAE Bonaparte, 1838 (*Geogr. comp. list birds Europe and N. America* p. 48) (type genus *Platalea* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* ed. 10, p. 139), type species *Platalea leucorodia* Linnaeus, 1758, (*Syst. Nat.*, ed. 10, p. 139), by subsequent designation (Gray, 1840, *List Gen. Birds*, p. 167)), has technical priority. PLATALEINAE is the accepted name for a small, highly specialised group, the spoonbills (French: spatules; German: Löffler) consisting of 3 genera with 6 species, which group is usually considered a subfamily of the ibises, although formerly it was often treated as a separate family (see Sharpe, 1898, *Cat. Birds Brit. Mus.* vol. 26). Until the adoption of the 1961 Code, priority did not apply to family-group names. A majority of those who included spoonbills and ibises in the same family used the ibis family name.

2. To accept PLATALEIDAE for the ibis family as a whole would [to use the language of Art. 23d(ii)] 'upset general usage', which is now overwhelmingly in favour of THRESKIORNITHIDAE (an unpublished Appendix is held on file in the I.C.Z.N. office). Moreover, extension to all the ibises of the name PLATALEIDAE, which has long been restricted by most ornithologists as the family (or subfamily) name of the small, highly-specialised spoonbill group, might be confusing. The Code itself (Recommendation 64A) recommends that family names be based on genera 'representative of the family'. This is true of THRESKIORNITHIDAE but would not be true of PLATALEIDAE.

3. For a long period, the family name used for the ibises (whether or not the spoonbills were included) was IBIDIDAE (Coues, 1884, *Key N. American Birds*, Ed. 2, pp. ix + 648; Sharpe, 1898, *Cat. Birds. Brit. Mus.*, vol. 26, p. 2), based on the subfamily name IBINAE proposed by Bonaparte (1853, *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, vol. 37, no. 18, p. 643), type genus *Ibis* Cuvier, 1817 [type species, by tautonymy, *Tantalus aethiopicus* Latham].

4. Richmond called to the attention of Mathews (1913, *Auk* vol. 30, p. 93 *et seq.*) that *Ibis* Cuvier, 1817, was preoccupied by an earlier genus *Ibis* (in the family CICONIIDAE) Lacépède, 1799, the type species, by tautonymy, of which was a stork, *Tantalus* [or *Ardea*] *ibis* Linnaeus [currently called *Ibis ibis* or *Mycteria ibis*]. The genus *Ibis* of Cuvier was replaced by its next senior synonym, *Threskiornis* Gray (1842, *Appendix List Gen. Birds*: 13), which had the same type species, *Tantalus aethiopicus* Latham, 1790 (*Indian Orn.*, vol. 2, p. 706, by original designation). In accordance with the then established principle of preserving the same taxonomic concept in family names, Richmond (1917, *Proc. U.S. Natl. Mus.* vol. 53, p. 636) proposed the new family name THRESKIORNITHIDAE. This family name (with the subfamily names THRESKIORNITHINAE and PLATALEINAE) was adopted in the important paper on family classification by Wetmore and Miller (1926, *Auk* vol. 43, p. 341). Eventually, throughout the world almost all ornithologists adopted this nomenclature. Meanwhile, however, Mathews (1913, op. cit.) had proposed the name PLEGADIDAE, based on the genus *Plegadis* Kaup, 1829, (Skizze Ent-Gesch. eur. Thieno, p. 42), type species by monotypy *Tantalus falcinellus* Linnaeus, 1766 (*Syst. Nat.* ed. 12, p. 241), apparently on the erroneous theory (cf. Code Art. 64) that family names should be based on the oldest included generic name. Actually, there was already in the literature a long unused older family-group name, EUDOCIMINAE Bonaparte, 1854 (see para. 9 infra).

5. The principle of continuing the taxonomic concept when a family-group name had to be replaced, by basing the new name on the next available generic name for the same taxon when homonymy required the replacement, was recognised in the Code, as originally published in 1961 [Arts. 39a and 39a(i); see also the somewhat analogous Art. 40a]. Under these provisions, THRESKIORNITHIDAE would automatically have become the replacement name and would have taken the date of IBIDIDAE (Bonaparte's IBINAE), which it replaced. For technical reasons (not here relevant), the special provisions as to automatic replacement of family group names based on generic homonyms [Art. 39a and a(i)] were deleted by Code amendment at the 1963 Washington Congress. However, the broad provision designed to preserve 'general usage' as against strict priority in family group names [Art. 23(d)(ii)], remains applicable, but under this article one must resort to the International Commission for decision.

6. That general usage overwhelmingly supports THRESKIORNITHIDAE is indubitable. Wetmore's (1930) classification for birds of the world (which had revised editions in 1934, 1940, 1951 and 1960) had consistently used THRESKIORNITHIDAE (as well as THRESKIORNITHOIDEA and THRESKIORNITHINAE), and is followed nomenclaturally (with some irrelevant modifications, chiefly in regard to the passerine families) by almost all ornithologists currently active. Peters' *Check-List of Birds of the World*, (ed. Mayr & Cottrell, 1979), vol. 1, p. 283,

which has set some nomenclatural standards, adopted THRESKIORNITHIDAE (with THRESKIORNITHINAE and PLATALEINAE as sub-families). The American Ornithologists' Union *Check-List of North American Birds* in its most recent editions (1957 and 1983) adopted the same treatment, and has been followed by the large number of regional books (state and provincial handbooks and check-lists), field-guides, and numerous articles in the United States and Canada that traditionally conform to the American Ornithologists' Union Check-list nomenclature. The same family and subfamily names were adopted by Hellmayr and Conover (1948), *Catalogue of Birds of the Americas,* regarded as the standard nomenclatural source for works dealing with neo-tropical birds, and widely followed in the abundant literature on the birds of the West Indies as well as Middle and South America (see also Meyer de Schauensee, 1966, 1970). In Europe, the authoritative Witherby *et al., Handbook of British Birds,* (1939) vol. 3, p. 118; (1941) vol. 5, p. 303) used THRESKIORNITHIDAE (including the spoonbills in the family) and was widely followed. Some authors adopted PLATALEIDAE or even PLEGADIDAE, especially writers on African birds. However, when Ripley's (1961) systematic *Synopsis of the Birds of India and Pakistan* and Vaurie's prestigious *Birds of the Palearctic Fauna, Non Passeriformes,* vol. 2, p. 77 (1965) adopted THRESKIORNITHIDAE, a shift to that name occurred even in countries where at one time another family name had been used for the ibises.

7. The Appendix includes a list of current books and other works using THRESKIORNITHIDAE and has been prepared chiefly to indicate the world-wide overwhelming majority usage of this name in recent works. By additional bibliographic effort the number of publications adopting the name could probably be doubled, especially for works on birds of the New World, where usage since 1931 has been almost unanimous. Included in the list are some popular books and field guides, because they affect usage of family names. Scientific names of bird families are widely employed by other zoologists, and the vast army of non-taxonomic bird students—not merely by ornithological systematists. Because of the enormous literature, preserving the stability and universality of such names is of special importance. This was recognised on the adoption of the 1961 Code, which, when it introduced the priority principle for family-group names, created difficult problems not only because it changed previously employed principles but because there were no adequate available synonymies for family-group names, at least in the vertebrate classes with the most abundant literature. For these reasons Art. 23d(ii), and similar provisions, were included to preserve existing general usage (see discussion and references in Mayr, 1969, *Principles of Systematic Zoology,* p. 357). We believe that the inclusion of Art. 23d(ii) was intended to allow the disregard of strict priority in favour of general usage for family-group names without resort to the two-thirds vote needed for exercise of the plenary powers.

8. The present overwhelming use of THRESKIORNITHIDAE by current authors throughout the world was not attained immediately on the

abandonment of IBIDIDAE, but was certainly already the majority usage in 1961. Mathews' name PLEGADIDAE for a time obtained a following in Australian and even in certain African publications, although long since replaced on both continents. PLATALEIDAE of Bonaparte had considerable use by British authors in the 1950's and to some extent on the continents of Europe, Africa and Asia. But the current British publications of the British Ornithologists' Union, such as Landsborough Thomson's *New Dictionary of Birds* (1964) and *The Status of Birds in Britain and Ireland* (1971), (which is the current British Check-list), and the most recent British handbooks, guides, and check-lists, use THRESKIORNITHIDAE. It is of interest that such careful systematists as Voous (1973) (Holarctic) and Serventy (1962) (Australia), who at one time employed PLATALEIDAE, have switched to THRESKIORNITHIDAE to conform with majority usage. One current author who employs PLATALEIDAE (with subfamilies THRESKIORNITHINAE and PLATALEINAE) is Brodkorb (1963, Catalogue of Fossil Birds (*Bull. Fla. State Mus.* vol. 7, no. 4, p. 277), on the theory of strict priority, in disregard of Code Art. 23d(ii). Condon (1975, *Check-list of Birds of Australia,* Pt. 1) adopted PLATALEIDAE (with subfamilies PLEGADINAE and PLATALEINAE), stating in a note that THRESKIORNITHIDAE and THRESKIORNITHINAE 'are equally well known'—certainly an understatement. So far as we are aware, Brodkorb has not been followed except to the extent that Condon has done so. Other recent Australian works use THRESKIORNITHIDAE (e.g. Serventy and Whittell, 1962; Frith, 1969; Slater, 1970; Macdonald, 1973).

9. Brodkorb has been of service nomenclaturally in calling attention to long-unused family-group names that must be considered in conserving the names in general use. Among these is EUDOCIMINAE Bonaparte, 1854, *Ann. Sci. nat.* (Paris), vol. 38, p. 142, based on the type genus *Eudocimus* Wagler, 1832, *Isis* (Oken), p. 1232 (type species *Scolopax rubra* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst Nat.* ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 145, by subsequent designation by Reichenow, 1877, *J. Ornithol.* vol. 25, p. 145), a family-group name apparently unused for a century or more. Considering their insistence on priority, it is surprising that Brodkorb and Condon failed to adopt this as the subfamily name for the ibises.

10. A question arises as to how the names EUDOCIMINAE Bonaparte and PLEGADIDAE Mathews should be treated, the former not in current use at all, the latter adopted by Condon as a subfamily name. They are subjective senior synonyms of THRESKIORNITHIDAE and THRESKIORNITHINAE, but based on different genera. Conceivably at some future time systematists might wish to erect a tribe for either or both of these ibidid genera and immediate allies. It therefore seems undesirable to totally suppress the names or to place them on the Official Index; it suffices for the Commission to rule that they shall be denied precedence over, and shall not displace, THRESKIORNITHIDAE and derived family-group names (see comment by I. W. B. Nye, *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 30, p. 14).

11. The Commission is therefore requested to use its plenary powers to take the following action:

(1) that the name THRESKIORNITHIDAE Richmond, 1917 (type genus *Threskiornis* Gray, 1842) with its coordinate family-group names is to be given nomenclatural precedence over PLATALEINAE Bonaparte, 1838 (type genus *Platalea* Linnaeus, 1758), PLEGADIDAE Mathews, 1913 (type genus *Plegadis* Kaup, 1829), EUDOCIMINAE Bonaparte, 1854 (type genus *Eudocimus* Wagler, 1832) and their coordinate family-group names, by any zoologist who attributes their respective type genera, or any of them, to the same family-group taxon as *Threskiornis* Gray, 1842;

(2) to place the name THRESKIORNITHIDAE Richmond, 1917 on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology, with an endorsement that it is to be given nomenclatural precedence over the family-group names PLATALEINAE Bonaparte, 1838, EUDOCIMINAE Bonaparte, 1854, and PLEGADIDAE Mathews, 1913, by anyone who attributes their respective type genera, or any of them, to the same family-group taxon as *Threskiornis* Gray, 1842;

(3) to place the names PLATALEINAE Bonaparte, 1838, PLEGADIDAE Mathews, 1913 and EUDOCIMINAE Bonaparte, 1854, on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with endorsements that none of them is to be given priority over THRESKIORNITHIDAE Richmond, 1917 by anyone who considers their respective type genera, or any of them, to belong to the same family-group taxon as *Threskiornis* Gray, 1842.

Editorial Note

Dr Parkes asks for an explanation of the delay in publishing this application, which was first received in 1975. This is mainly due to pressure of work (especially on the third edition of the Code, and in managing the Trust's appeal for funds) and to shortage of staff in the Commission's office. Delays in correspondence beyond the control of the Secretariat and following the death of the late Dr Eisenmann were additional contributory factors.

R.V.M.

CRICETODON MINUS [sic] LARTET, 1851 (MAMMALIA, RODENTIA): REVISED REQUEST FOR A RULING ON INTERPRETATION. Z.N.(S.)1854

By the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

In 1969 (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 25, pp. 178–183) Dr M. Freudenthal (*Rijksmuseum van Geologie en Mineralogie, Leiden, Netherlands*) and Dr V. Fahlbusch (*Institut für Geologie und historische Geologie, München, Germany*) jointly asked for a ruling on the interpretation of the name *Cricetodon minus* [sic; correctly *minor*] Lartet, 1851. The species is one of three species of fossil hamster from the Miocene at Sansan (Gers), France. The name *Cricetodon minor* (the species is the nominal type species, by original designation, of *Democricetodon* Fahlbusch, 1964) has been used in two different ways for the past 20 years: French-speaking and Dutch-speaking workers use the name in the sense of Schaub, 1925; German-speaking workers use it in the sense of Fahlbusch, 1964. The two applicants thus represented the two schools of usage.

2. In October 1969 (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 26, p. 122) Professor Pierre Mein (*Université de Lyon, France*) urged the Commission to ratify Schaub's usage but asked for a delay pending the publication of the work of Madame Baudelot of Toulouse. In her 1972 thesis (unpublished, so far as I know, in any other form), she followed Schaub's usage but did not examine the nomenclatural problem as such. In fact, the two schools of usage differ in their interpretations of certain taxonomic facts, and it is essential to state these first before clear proposals for resolving the nomenclatural confusion can be put forward.

3. In October 1983 I reopened the file on this case. I am indebted to both Dr Freudenthal and Dr Fahlbusch for further advice. I have also consulted Dr B. Engesser (*Naturhistorisches Museum, Basel, Switzerland*) and Dr R. Daams (*Geologisch Instituut, Rijksuniversiteit, Groningen, Netherlands*) and am grateful for their help.

THE TAXONOMIC FACTS

4. Lartet, 1851, described the new genus *Cricetodon* from the Miocene of Sansan with three included species, all new:

C. sansaniense: 'Un peu plus grand que le Hamster'

C. medium: 'D'un tiers moindre que le *Cricetodon sansaniense* et plus petit que notre rat noir'

C. minus: 'Plus petit que notre souris domestique'.

(The specific names should all be masculine in termination.) No type species was designated until 1925, when Schaub designated *C. sansaniensis*.

5. Gervais, 1859, pl. 44, figs 21–26, figured, 'quelques débris de *Cricetodons* de Sansan qui m'ont été donnés par M. Lartet'. Although no names are given to the figures and the specimens are lost, Dr Freudenthal recognises *C. minor* sensu Schaub among them.

6. Schaub, 1925, recognised five species of *Cricetodon* at Sansan. These included *C. helveticus* Schaub, 1925, *C. gaillardi* Schaub, 1925 and *C. affinis* Schaub, 1925, but not *C. medius* Lartet, 1851, which Schaub could not recognise in the fauna. Schaub used the name *C. minor* Lartet for the smallest species present, and his usage of the name was generally followed thereafter until 1964.

7. In 1964 Fahlbusch described the new genus *Democricetodon* and designated *C. minor* Lartet, 1851 as its type species. He designated a lectotype for this species from among specimens in the Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle in Paris, but not all workers accept that these specimens are syntypes of the three species described by Lartet. Freudenthal points out that although *C. minor* is the commonest species at Sansan, where it forms 25% of the hamster fauna, it is not represented in the collection supposed to be Lartet's. There is no documentary evidence of the origins of this collection, nor any original labels by Lartet.

8. In the same work Fahlbusch also described *Megacricetodon* as a new subgenus of *Democricetodon* and designated *C. gregarius* Schaub, 1925 as its type species. In this subgenus he placed *C. schaubi* sp. nov. for *C. minor* Schaub non Lartet, and designated a holotype from the Basel Museum. In the subgenus *D. (Democricetodon)* he also placed *D. minor brevis* (Schaub, 1925). In his treatment of Schaub's taxa he upset nomenclatural usages that had been stable for nearly 40 years.

DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

9. Dr Freudenthal holds that Schaub's treatment of *C. minor* is closer to Lartet's original concept than is Fahlbusch's; moreover, his *C. minor* is the smaller of the two. It is consistent with Lartet's description 'plus petit que notre souris domestique' while Fahlbusch's is not. He recognises two small species at Sansan and thinks that Lartet may have confused them under *C. minor*. He places the true *C. minor* of Lartet (and, for him, of Schaub) not in *Democricetodon* but in *Megacricetodon*. He rejects Fahlbusch's lectotype as invalid and would like a suitable neotype to be designated for the species. For this he proposes the holotype of *M. schaubi* Fahlbusch. At the same time, he would like *D. brevis crassus* Freudenthal, 1969 to be designated as type species of *Democricetodon*, since that corresponds with Fahlbusch's concept of the genus. Both actions require the use of the plenary powers.

10. Dr Fahlbusch agrees that Lartet probably confused two small species of *Cricetodon* from Sansan, but holds to the validity of the lectotype that he designated for *C. minor*. He asks that his interpretation of that species be ratified by placing its name, as applied by reference to his lecto-

type, on the Official List. This would automatically give validity to his usage of the genus-group names involved.

11. Dr Freudenthal's view is supported by Dr Daams; Dr Fahlbusch's view is supported by Dr Engesser.

THE EVIDENCE OF USAGE

12. The following references show usage since 1964 in the respective senses of Schaub and Fahlbusch:

Usage in the sense of Schaub

AGUILAR, J. F. 1979. *C.r. Acad. Sci. Paris*, ser. D, vol. 288, no. 5, pp. 473–476.
—— 1980a. *Palaeovertebrata* vol. 9, part 6, pp. 155–203.
—— 1980b. *Palaeovertebrata*, Mém. jubil. R. Lavocat, pp. 355–364.
—— & MAGNE, J. 1978. *Bull. Soc. géol. France*, ser. vol. 20, pp. 803–805.
BAUDELOT, S. 1964. *Bull. Soc. Hist. nat. Toulouse*, vol. 99, parts 1–2, pp. 195–204.
—— 1965. *C.r. somm. Séances Soc. géol. France* for 1965, fasc. 7, p. 222.
—— 1969. *Trav. Lab. Géol.-pétr. Fac. Sci. Toulouse*, no. 35, 2 pp.
—— 1972. *Etude des chiroptères, insectivores et rongeurs du Miocène de Sansan.* (Thesis, Toulouse).
—— & COLLIER, A. 1978. *Bull. Soc. Hist. nat. Toulouse*, vol. 114, parts 1–3, pp. 194–206.
BULOT, C. 1972. *Bull. Soc. Hist. nat. Toulouse*, vol. 108, parts 3–4, pp. 349–356.
DAAMS, R. 1976. *Proc. k. nederl. Akad. Wet.*, Ser. B. vol. 79, No. 3, pp. 152–181.
—— 1981. *Utrecht micropal. Bull.*, Spec. Publ. 3, pp. 1–115.
——, FREUDENTHAL M. & v.d. WEERD, A. 1977. *Newsl. Stratigr.* vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 42–55.
FREUDENTHAL, M. 1965. *Proc. k. nederl. Akad. Wet.*, Ser. B, vol. 68, No. 5, pp. 293–305.
—— 1968. *Proc. k. nederl. Akad. Wet.*, Ser. B, vol. 71, No. 1, pp. 52–72.
—— & SONDAAR, P. Y. 1964. *Proc. k. nederl. Akad. Wet.*, Ser. B, vol. 67, No. 5, pp. 473–490.
GUÉRIN, C. & MEIN, P. 1971. *Docum. Lab. Géol. Univ. Lyon*, N.S., pp. 131–170.
HARTENBERGER, J. L. 1967. *Palaeovertebrata*, vol. 1, part 2, pp. 47–64, 4 pls.
LACOMBA, J. I. in press. *Scripta Geol.*
LOPEZ, M., SESE, C. & SANZ, J. L. *Trab. Neógeno/Quaternario*, vol. 8, pp. 47–73.
MEIN, P. & CORNET, C. 1973. *C.r. somm. Soc. géol. France*, 1973, 2 pp.
—— & FREUDENTHAL, M. 1971. *Scripta Geol.*, vol. 2, pp. 1–37.
SAVAGE, D. E. & RUSSELL, D. E. 1983. *Mammalian palaeofaunas of the world.* London, Addison-Webley.
SESE, C. 1977. *Trab. Neógeno-Quaternario*, vol. 8, pp. 127–180.

Usage in the sense of Fahlbusch

DEHM, R. 1978. *Mitt. bayer. Staatsamml. Paläont. hist. Geol.*, vol. 18, pp. 289–313.
ENGESSER, B. 1972. *Tätigk. Ber. naturf. Ges. Baselland*, vol. 28, pp. 37–363.
FEJFAR, O. 1974. *Palaeontographica* Ser. B, vol. 146, pp. 100–179.

HEITZMANN, E. 1973. *Palaeontographica*, Suppl. Bd. 8, part 5B, pp. 1–95.
WU WENYU, 1982. *Zitteliana*, vol. 9, pp. 1–80.

NOMENCLATURAL CONSIDERATIONS

13. Apart from usage, which is strongly in favour of Schaub's interpretation, the principal nomenclatural issue at stake is the status of Fahlbusch's lectotype of *Cricetodon minor* Lartet, 1851. This is one of a group of specimens in the Paris Museum which has no certain connection with Lartet. It does not contain any representative of *C. minor* sensu stricto, although that is the commonest species of the genus at Sansan. The only specimens for which there is evidence of a direct connection with Lartet are those figured by Gervais, 1869. These include representatives of *C. minor* sensu Schaub, but are lost.

14. Under these circumstances, it seems to me unsafe to accept Fahlbusch's lectotype as valid. The presumption surely must be that it is invalid in the absence of stronger evidence in support of its validity than any that has so far been produced. At the same time both taxonomic and nomenclatural confusion clearly exists, so that there is good justification for the designation of a neotype. The only neotype so far designated is No. Ss. 1235 in the Basel Museum (Freudenthal, 1969, *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 25, p. 180). The Commission can accept this without using its plenary powers; or it can use those powers to set aside Freudenthal's neotype and set up Fahlbusch's lectotype as neotype in its place.

15. The Commission is accordingly asked to choose one of the following alternatives:

ALTERNATIVE A

(1) to rule that the lectotype designated by Fahlbusch, 1964, for *Cricetodon minor* Lartet, 1851, is invalid;

(2) to use its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type species for the nominal genus *Democricetodon* Fahlbusch, 1964, hitherto made, and to designate *Democricetodon crassus* Freudenthal, 1969, as the type species of that genus;

(3) to place the generic name *Democricetodon* Fahlbusch, 1964 (gender: masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in A(2) above, *Democricetodon crassus* Freudenthal, 1969, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(4) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(a) *minor* Lartet, 1851, as published in the binomen *Cricetodon minus* [sic], as defined by reference to the neotype designated by Freudenthal, 1969;

(b) *crassus* Freudenthal, 1969, as published in the combination *Democricetodon brevis crassus* (specific name of type species of *Democriceton* Fahlbusch, 1964).

ALTERNATIVE B

(1) to use its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type specimen for the nominal species *Cricetodon minor* Lartet, 1851, hitherto made, and to designate as neotype of that species the specimen designated as lectotype by Fahlbusch, 1964;

(2) to place the specific name *minor* Lartet, 1851, as published in the binomen *Cricetodon minus* [sic], and as interpreted by reference to the neotype designated under the plenary powers in B(1) above, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

FAHLBUSCH, V. 1964. Die Cricetiden (Mamm.) der oberen Süsswasser-Molasse Bayerns. *Abh. bayerischen Akad. Wiss., Math.-Naturwiss. Klasse*, N.F. vol. 118, pp. 1–136.

FREUDENTHAL, M. 1963. Entwicklungsstufen der miozänen Cricetodontinae (Mammalia, Rodentia), Mittelspaniens und ihre stratigraphische Bedeutung. *Beaufortia*, vol. 10, no. 119, pp. 51–157.

GERVAIS, P. 1859. *Zoologie et paléontologie françaises*, 2nd edit., viii + 544 pp., Atlas.

LARTET, P. 1851. *Notice sur la colline de Sansan*, 47 pp.

SCHAUB, S. 1925. Die hamsterartigen Nagetiere des Tertiärs und ihre lebenden Verwandten. *Abh. schweizerischen paläontol. Ges.*, vol. 45, pp. 1–114.

REPORT ON *GLYPHIPTERIX* HÜBNER, [1825] (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA): Z.N.(S.)2115

By the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

This case began with an application by Diakonoff & Heppner, 1977, *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 34, pp. 81–84, for the use of the plenary powers to designate a type species for *Glyphipterix* Hübner, [1825], a genus based on a misidentified type species. Bradley & Sattler, 1978, *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, pp. 71–72, thought that this end could be achieved without the use of the plenary powers. The Commission's vote on the case in V.P. (82)15 was inconclusive and a new vote must therefore be taken under Bylaw 35. In addition, a comment by Dr Nye on his voting paper has introduced new factors. The essential facts are set out below.

2. *Glyphipterix* Hübner, [1825] was established with three originally included species: *Phalaena linneella* Clerck, 1759, *Tinea aillyella* Hübner, [1817] and *Tinea humerella* Hübner, [1805]. Diakonoff & Heppner gave evidence to show that Hübner misidentified *P. linneella* Clerck, and this is not disputed by Bradley & Sattler. All agree that the species intended by Hübner was *Tinea bergstraesserella* Fabricius, 1781.

3. According to Diakonoff & Heppner, the type species of the genus in question was fixed by Westwood, 1840, p. 112 (cited as *'Glyphipteryx* Hb.') as *Phalaena linneella* Clerck, 1759. According to Bradley & Sattler, it was fixed by Meyrick, 1914, as *Tinea aillyella* Hübner, [1817]. This species is congeneric with *T. bergstraesserella* Fabricius, 1781, which Diakonoff & Heppner wish to see fixed as the type species of *Glyphipterix* in the superfamily COPROMORPHOIDEA.

4. *Glyphipteryx* Curtis, 1827 was established with *Phalaena linneella* Clerck, 1759 as type species by original designation. Curtis correctly identified and illustrated the species, which is currently referred either to *Glyphipteryx* Curtis (by those who regard that name as denoting a nominal genus distinct from *Glyphipterix* Hübner) or to *Chrysoclista* Stainton, 1854 (by those who take the opposite view) in the superfamily GELECHIOIDEA. *Phalaena linneella* Clerck is the type species of *Chrysoclista,* by subsequent designation by Fletcher, 1928, *Cat. Indian Insects,* part 16, p. 25.

5. Diakonoff & Heppner claim that the use of the names *Glyphipterix* and *Glyphipteryx* for different nominal genera is a cause of confusion and say that 'the well known and widely used' *Chrysoclista* can be used instead of the latter (the two being objective synonyms). Bradley & Sattler deny that confusion is likely because the two genera are placed in different superfamilies. They therefore wish to retain *Glyphipteryx* Curtis, 1827 as the valid name for the genus of which *P. linneella* Clerck, 1759 is the type species.

6. One question that must clearly be answered before the possible solutions to this case can be clearly assessed concerns the relationship between *Glyphipterix* Hübner and *Glyphipteryx* Curtis. Do these names represent one or two nominal genera? Light was thrown on this by Dr Nye, in the following comment on his voting paper: 'From my own knowledge and from the cases of the proposers and the critics it is clear that the usages of *Glyphipterix* Hübner and *Glyphipteryx* Curtis have been confused. Curtis knew Hübner's work and as the name *linneella* was the name used for the first species included by both authors it follows that *'Glyphipteryx* Nob.' of Curtis was intended as an emendation of Hübner's name (as stated by Neave, *Nomencl. zool.*, vol. 2, p. 482) and that the first type–species designation was of *linneella* by Curtis, 1827, for the genus whose name was spelt in one way by Hübner and in another way by Curtis. However, as Hübner had misidentified *linneella,* Article 70 must be applied and I agree with the proposers that the designation of *Tinea bergstraesserella* Fabricius will maintain stability and universality in this important genus.

'I also agree with the proposers that *Glyphipteryx* Curtis should be placed on the Official Index, but there is no need to suppress it as it is an unjustified emendation of *Glyphipterix* Hübner and thus a junior objective synonym. *Chrysoclista* Stainton, 1854 is available for the small and little-known genus having the true *Phalaena linneella* Clerck, 1759 as its type species, but not by original designation as stated by the proposers. The earliest designation is by Fletcher, 1928, *Cat. Indian Ins.*, part 16, p. 25.

'I cannot agree with the proposers on their spelling of the family-group name based on the generic name *Glyphipterix*. That GLYPHIPTERIGIDAE should be the correct spelling is not only common sense but matches the existing Microlepidoptera family names COSMOPTERIGIDAE from *Cosmopterix* and MICROPTERIGIDAE from *Micropterix,* and most of all maintains the stable usage throughout the world as shown by Bradley & Sattler.'

7. Dr Nye's view of the relationship between *Glyphipterix* and *Glyphipteryx* corresponds with common sense and with what we know of the habits of Curtis and his contemporaries. There is no doubt that 'pteryx' is a more correct latinisation from the Greek than 'pterix'. Westwood put *'Glyphipteryx* Hb.' and this emendation has been used both for the genus with the misidentified *linneella* (= *bergstraesserella*) as its type species and for the one having the true *linneella* as its type species. The potential for confusion therefore clearly exists, and it is surely for those who take Curtis to have proposed a new name to prove their case. The prima facie evidence is clearly in favour of those who take Curtis's name to be an emendation.

8. The question of the spelling of the family name reveals a conflict between two articles of the Code, to be dealt with under Article 78b(i). Under Article 32c GLYPHIPTERYGIDAE Stainton, 1854 is an incorrect original spelling, to be corrected wherever it is found; under Article 29d, it is an incorrectly formed name established before 1961 and not to be corrected. The Commission must clearly decide which of these provisions is

to take precedence over the other; it is here proposed that Article 32c be given precedence over Article 29d.

9. The Commission voted on V.P.(82)15 in which a choice was offered between Alternatives A (the proposals of Diakonoff & Heppner) and B (the proposals of Bradley & Sattler). At the close of the voting period, 18 valid and unequivocal votes had been cast, 10 for A and 8 for B. As the former required the use of the plenary powers, and as it received a majority smaller than a two-thirds majority, the case must be presented again. Alternative B, which required only a simple majority, received a minority of votes and is lost.

10. Dr Nye divided his vote between the two alternatives and in this he was independently followed by Dr Mroczkowski and Dr Trjapitzin. All three voted for the use of the plenary powers to designate *Tinea bergstraesserella* as type species of *Glyphipterix* Hübner and for the placing of GLYPHIPTERIGIDAE on the Official List.

11. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is therefore now requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Glyphipterix* Hübner, [1825] and having done so, to designate *Tinea bergstraesserella* Fabricius, 1781 as the type species of that genus;

(2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:
   (a) *Glyphipterix* Hübner, [1825] (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Tinea bergstraesserella* Fabricius, 1781;
   (b) *Chrysoclista* Stainton, 1854 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Fletcher, 1928, *Phalaena linneella* Clerck, 1759;

(3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
   (a) *bergstraesserella* Fabricius, 1781, as published in the binomen *Tinea bergstraesserella* (specific name of type species of *Glyphipterix* Hübner, [1825];
   (b) *linneella* Clerck, 1759, as published in the binomen *Phalaena linneella* (specific name of type species of *Chrysoclista* Stainton, 1854;

(4) in the matter of the spelling of the name of the family of which *Glyphipterix* Hübner, [1825] is the type genus, to rule that Article 32c shall have precedence over Article 29d, and having done so to place GLYPHIPTERIGIDAE Stainton, 1854 (type genus *Glyphipterix* Hübner, [1825]) on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology;

(5) to place the generic name *Glyphipteryx* Curtis, 1827 (an unjustified emendation of *Glyphipterix* Hübner, [1825]) on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology;

(6) to place the family-group name GLYPHIPTERYGIDAE Stainton, 1854 (invalid through the ruling given in (4) above) on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology.

OCTOLASION ÖRLEY, 1885 (ANNELIDA, OLIGOCHAETA, LUMBRICIDAE): RATIFICATION OF THE DESIGNATION OF THE TYPE SPECIES AND THE INTRODUCTION OF *OCTOLASION* (*OCTODRILUS*) BY OMODEO, 1956 IN ACCORDANCE WITH USAGE, WITH THE SUPPRESSION OF THE DESIGNATION OF THE TYPE SPECIES AND OF THE NAMES *OCTOLASION* (*INCOLORE*) AND *OCTOLASION* (*PURPUREUM*) BY OMODEO, 1952. Z.N.(S.) 2469

By R. W. Sims (*British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.*)

The genus *Octolasion* was proposed by Örley (1885, p. 13) to accommodate several Hungarian species of earthworms of the family LUMBRICIDAE. Over the years actions by authors have led to nomenclatural confusion that in part requires the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to exercise its plenary powers to deal with the problems now extant. However, before detailing the application, it is useful to review the results of attempts retrospectively to latinise the spelling of the name.

2. *Octolasion* was unjustifiably emended to *Octolasia* by Rosa (1896, p. 3) then, possibly to provide a termination consistent with its original (neuter) gender, the spelling was further changed to *Octolasium* by Michaelsen (1900, p. 504). As the latter emendation was proposed in Michaelsen's authoritative monograph, it passed into general usage. However, in 1964 Gerard reverted to the original orthography and since that date there has been discord with some authors complying with the provisions of Article 32 of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature and others, as is evident in the application below, either unaware of an infringement of the Code or unwilling to dispute Michaelsen's authority.

3. The problems other than matters of orthography, that threaten the stability of the nomenclature of the genus and of its species have arisen mainly from two disparate designations of a type species and descriptions of subgenera. In a review of the genus *Octolasium* (sic), Omodeo (1952, p. 46):

(1) designated *Lumbricus complanatus* Dugès, 1828 as the type species,

(2) described the subgenera (*Incolore*), type species *Lumbricus terrestris* var. *lacteus* Örley, 1881, and (*Purpureum*), type species *Allolobophora lissaensis* Michaelsen, 1891.

But in a review of the family LUMBRICIDAE, Omodeo (1956, p. 206):

(1) designated *Lumbricus terrestris* var. *lacteus* Örley, 1881 as the type species of *Octolasium* (sic),

(2) described the subgenus (*Octodrilus*), type species *Lumbricus complanatus* Dugès, 1828.

4. The subsequent review, although invalid, provided the ingredients for total confusion. Fortunately for the stability of nomenclature, Omodeo's earlier actions of 1952 have been overlooked (except for a notification of the preparation of this application: Sims, 1983). There has, however, been a unanimity of approval and adoption of the later proposals, for example, Gerard, 1964; Bouché, 1972; Gates, 1973; Perel, 1979; Zicsi, 1981; and Easton, 1983; while the 1956 subgenus (*Octodrilus*) has been elevated to generic rank and widely accepted as a valid taxon. Clearly the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should use its plenary powers to regularise the situation, the more so since these species are commonly recorded by ecologists and others unfamiliar with nomenclature. Otherwise if the Code were now rigorously applied then the species currently placed in the genus *Octolasion* would be transferred to the overlooked *Incolore* while current members of the genus *Octodrilus* would be assigned to a new concept *Octolasion* containing *Octodrilus* as an objective synonym and *Purpureum* as a subjective synonym.

5. In addition to the potential confusion detailed above, the difficulties could be compounded by the introduction of yet another generic name that has been associated briefly with *Octolasion*. The name is *Alyattes* proposed by Kinberg, 1867, type, by tautonymy, *Lumbricus alyattes* Kinberg, 1867, now regarded (Michaelsen, 1900, p. 506) as a subjective synonym of *Octolasion cyaneum* (Savigny, 1826). However, the name *Alyattes* Kinberg, 1867 is a junior homonym of both *Alyattes* Thomson, 1864 (Coleoptera) and *Alyattes* Stål, 1865 (Hemiptera), so it must be rejected in favour of the available name of its junior subjective synonym *Octolasion* Örley, 1885.

6. The following references show the relative usages of the generic names involved.

References using the name *OCTOLASION* Örley, 1885 employing the correct spelling:

Easton, E. G. 1983. A guide to the valid names of Lumbricidae. In Satchell, J. E. (ed.) *Earthworm ecology*, pp. 475–487. London, Chapman & Hall.

Edwards, C. A. & Lofty, J. R. 1972. *Biology of earthworms*, pp. 1–283. London, Chapman & Hall.

Gates, G. E. 1973. The earthworm genus *Octolasion* in America. *Bull. Tall Timbers res. Stn* vol. 14(8) pp. 29–50.

Gates, G. E. 1982. Farewell to North American Megadriles. *Megadrilogica*, vol. 4(1–2), pp. 12–77.

Gerard, B. M. 1964. Lumbricidae (Annelida). *Synopses Brit. Fauna* vol. 6, pp. 1–58. London, The Linnean Society of London.

Jamieson, B. G. M. 1981. *The ultrastructure of the Oligochaeta*, pp. 1–462. London, Academic Press.

Lofs-Holmin, A. 1983. Earthworm population dynamics in different agricultural

rotations. In Satchell, J. E. (ed.) *Earthworm ecology*, pp. 151–160. London, Chapman & Hall.
Reynolds, J. W. 1972. Earthworms (Lumbricidae) of the Haliburton Highlands, Ontario, Canada. *Megadrilogica*, vol. 1(3), pp. 1–11.
Reynolds, J. W. 1977. *The earthworms (Lumbricidae and Sparganophilidae) of Ontario*, pp. 1–141. Toronto, Royal Ontario Museum.
Sims, R. W. 1983. The scientific names of earthworms. In Satchell, J. E. (ed.) *Earthworm ecology*, pp. 467–474. London, Chapman & Hall.
Sims, R. W. & Gerard, B. M. 1985. Earthworms. *Synopses Brit. Fauna* (N.S.) (in press). Leiden, Brill.

References using the name *OCTODRILUS* Omodeo, 1956:

Bouché, M. B. 1972. Lombriciens de France: Écologie et Systématique. *Annls Zool. Écol. anim.* (Numéro spécial) vol. 72(2), pp. 1–671.
Easton, E. G. 1983. A guide to the valid names of Lumbricidae. In Satchell, J. E. (ed.) *Earthworm ecology*, pp. 475–487. London, Chapman & Hall.
Michalis, K. 1975. Die Oligochaeten der Insel Kos. *Sci. Annals Fac. Phys. u. Mathem., Univ. Thessaloniki*, vol. 15, pp. 187–200.
Plisko, J. D. & Zicsi, A. 1970. *Octolasium (Octodrilus) rucneri* n.sp. ein neuer Regenwurm aus Jugoslawien. *Acta zool. Hung.* vol. 16, pp. 453–456.
Reynolds, J. W. & Cook, D. G. 1976. *Nomenclatura Oligochaetologica*, pp. 1–217. Fredericton, University of New Brunswick.
Sapkarev, J. A. 1972. Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Lumbricidenfauna Griechenlands. *Maced. Acad. Sci. Arts*, vol. 4, pp. 31–36.
Sapkarev, J. A. 1977. The fauna of earthworms of Macedonie, 7. The earthworms (Olig. Lumbricidae) of Ohrid-Struga valley. *Ann. Fac. Biol. Univ. Kiril et Metodij Skopje*, vol. 30, pp. 27–45.
Zicsi, A. 1982. Verzeichnis der bis 1971 beschriebenen und revidierten Taxa der Familie Lumbricidae (Oligochaeta). *Acta zool. Hung.* vol. 28 (3–4), pp. 421–454.
Zicsi, A. 1983. Earthworm ecology in deciduous forests in central and southeast Europe. In Satchell, J. E. (ed.) *Earthworm ecology*, pp. 171–177. London, Chapman & Hall.
Zicsi, A. & Michalis, K. 1981. Übersicht der Regenwurm-Fauna Griechenlands (Oligochaeta: Lumbricidae). *Acta zool. Hung.* vol. 27, pp. 239–264.

References using the names *OCTOLASIUM* (sic) (*INCOLORE*) Omodeo, 1952 and *OCTOLASIUM* (sic) (*PURPUREUM*) Omodeo, 1952:

No records.
Note. Omodeo's actions of 1952 are ignored, see: Reynolds, J. W. & Cook, D. G. 1976. *Nomenclatura Oligochaetologica*, 1–217. Fredericton, New Brunswick.
In this work the 1952 type designation of *Octolasion* and the names *Incolore* and *Purpureum* are omitted, yet the 1956 type designation of *Octolasion* and the name *Octodrilus* are accepted as valid.

7. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

(1) to use the plenary powers:
  (a) to suppress the genus-group names *Incolore* Omodeo, 1952 and *Purpureum* Omodeo, 1952 for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;
  (b) to set aside all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Octolasion* Örley, 1885, and to designate *Lumbricus terrestris* var. *lacteus* Örley, 1881 as type species thereof;

(2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:
  (a) *Octolasion* Örley, 1885 (gender: neuter), type species by designation under the plenary powers in (1) (b) above, *Lumbricus terrestris* var. *lacteus* Örley, 1881;
  (b) *Octodrilus* Omodeo, 1956 (gender: masculine), type species by original designation, *Lumbricus complanatus* Dugès, 1828;

(3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
  (a) *lacteus* Örley, 1885, as published in the trinomen *Lumbricus terrestris* var. *lacteus* (specific name of the type species of *Octolasion* Örley, 1885);
  (b) *complanatus* Dugès, 1828, as published in the binomen *Lumbricus complanatus* (specific name of the type species of *Octodrilus* Omodeo, 1956);

(4) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology the generic names:
  (a) *Incolore* Omodeo, 1952 and *Purpureum* Omodeo, 1952, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(a) above;
  (b) *Alyattes* Kinberg, 1867, a junior homonym of *Alyattes* Thomson, 1864;
  (c) *Octolasia* Rosa, 1893 and *Octolasium* Michaelsen, 1900 as unjustified emendations of *Octolasion* Örley, 1885.

REFERENCES

BOUCHÉ, M. B. 1972. Lombriciens de France: Écologie et Systématique. *Annls Zool. Écol. anim. Paris*, (INRA) vol. 72–2, pp. 1–671.

DUGÈS, A. 1828. Recherches sur la circulation, la respiration et la reproduction des Annélides abranches sétigères. *Ann. Sci. nat.* vol. 15, pp. 285–337.

EASTON, E. G. 1983. A guide to the valid names of Lumbricidae (Oligochaeta). In *Earthworm ecology from Darwin to vermiculture*, ed. Satchell, J. E. pp. 475–487. London, Chapman and Hall.

GATES, G. E. 1973. Contributions to North American earthworms (Annelida) No.8. The earthworm genus *Octolasion* in America. *Bull. Tall Timbers res. Stn* vol. 15, pp. 1–13.

GERARD, B. M. 1964. Lumbricidae (Annelida) with keys and descriptions (Second edition). *Synopses of the British Fauna*, vol. 6, pp. 1–58. London, The Linnean Society of London.

KINBERG, J. G. H. 1867. Annulata nova. *Ofvers. K. Vetensk Akad. Förh. Stockh.* vol. 23, pp. 97–103.

MICHAELSEN, W. 1891. Oligochaeten des Naturhistorischen Museum in Hamburg, IV. *Jb. hamb. wiss. Anst.* vol. 8, pp. 3–42.

MICHAELSEN, W. 1900. Oligochaeta. *Tierreich,* vol. 10, pp. 1–575.

OMODEO, P. 1952. Materiali zoologici raccolti dal Dr Marcuzzi sulle Alpi Dolomitiche. *Arch. zool. ital.* vol. 37, pp. 29–59.

OMODEO, P. 1956. Contributo alla revisione dei Lumbricidae. *Arch. zool. ital.* vol. 41, pp. 129–212.

ÖRLEY, L. 1881. A magyarorszagi Oligochaeták Faunája; Terricolae (Reudszaertani rész). *Math. Term. tud. Közlem,* vol. 16, pp. 561–611.

ÖRLEY, L. 1885. A palaearktikus övben élö Terricoláknak revíziója és elterjedése. *Értek. Term. tud. Kor.* vol. 15, pp. 1–34.

PEREL, T. S. 1979. [*Range and regularities in the distribution of earthworms of the USSR fauna (with keys to Lumbricidae and other Megadrili).*] 1–272. Moscow, Nauka (Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., Laboratory of Forest Science). [In Russian: English summary.]

ROSA, D. 1896. *Allolobophora tigrina* ed. *A. exacystis* n.sp. *Boll. Musei Zool. Anat. comp. R. Univ, Torino,* No. 246, vol. 11, pp. 1–4.

SAVIGNY, J. C. 1826. [La multiplicité des espèces de ver de terre . . .] *Mém. Acad. Sci. Inst. Fr.* (Phys.) vol. 5, pp. 176–184.

SIMS, R. W. 1983. The scientific names of earthworms. In *Earthworm ecology from Darwin to vermiculture,* ed. Satchell, J. E. pp. 467–474. London, Chapman and Hall.

STÅL, C. 1865. *Hemiptera Africana,* vol. 3, pp. 1–200. Holmiae, Officina Nordstediana.

THOMSON, J. 1864. *Systema Cerambycidarum,* pp. 1–578. Liége, Dessain.

ZICSI, A. 1981. Weitere Angaben zur Lumbricidenfauna Italiens (Oligochaeta: Lumbricidae). *Opusc. Zool. Budapest* vol. 17–18, pp. 157–180.

LEPTOSIA HÜBNER, 1818 (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA): CORRECTION TO OPINION 584 AND TO THE OFFICIAL LIST. Z.N.(S.)1324

By Lieut.Col. C. F. Cowan (*4 Thornfield Terrace, Grange-over-Sands, Cumbria LA11 7DR, U.K.*)

Leptosia Hübner, 1818 is name number 1398 on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* (Instalment 2, p. 219). It was so placed by Opinion 584 of 1960 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 17 (9/11), p. 290, para. 3 (b)) after an Application published in 1958 (*ibid.* 16 (3) pp. 81–87, para. 12 (3) (b)).

2. In both 1958 and 1960, the subparas 3(b) stated that the type species, *Leptosia chlorographa* Hübner, 1818, was selected by Butler, 1870, and that detail is incorporated in the *Official List*. The selection in that sense, which is the valid one, was by Scudder, 1875 (*Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts Sci.* Boston vol. 10, p. 204), as indeed is stated in the last seven lines of para. 11 of the Application (on p. 86).

3. Hübner, 1818, included only two species when introducing the new name *Leptosia*: *L. chlorographa*, a new species, and *Papilio alcesta* Stoll. Then in [1819] he added to them *L. lathyri* Hübner (= *P. sinapis* L.) and a fourth. Butler, 1870, did not select *L. chlorographa*. His selection, made from the [1819] list, was '*L. lathyri* Hübner'. Thus not only is the *Official List* objectively in error, but Butler's selection of a species not originally included was invalid. The first valid selection was Scudder's in 1875.

4. The International Commission is therefore requested to fulfil the intentions of the Opinion and the *Official List* by:

(a) directing that Opinion 584 paragraph 3 (b) be corrected to read Scudder, 1875 (*Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts Sci.* Boston vol. 10, p. 204) instead of Butler, 1870 (*Cist. Ent.* 1(3), p. 54), and then

(b) amending the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, Instalment 2, p. 219, No. 1398 accordingly.

REVISED SUBMISSION REGARDING THE NOMINAL GENUS *DIPLOSOMA* MACDONALD, 1859 (ASCIDIACEA), AND PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE DESIGNATION OF *LEPTOCLINUM FULGENS* MILNE EDWARDS, 1841, AS TYPE SPECIES OF *LEPTOCLINUM* MILNE EDWARDS, 1841. Z.N.(S.)1766

By F. W. E. Rowe (*Australian Museum, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia*)

In 1966 I submitted (Rowe, 1966b) a detailed proposal outlining a case for firstly, the suppression of the generic name *Leptoclinum* Milne Edwards, 1841 and secondly, the placing of the generic name *Diplosoma* MacDonald, 1859 (type species by monotypy *D. rayneri* MacDonald, 1859) and the specific name *listerianum* Milne Edwards (in the binomen *Leptoclinum listerianum*) on the Official List of Generic Names and of Specific Names in Zoology respectively. The case was presented because of confusion existing over the use of the generic names *Didemnum* Savigny, 1816, *Leptoclinum* Milne Edwards, 1841 and *Diplosoma* MacDonald, 1859, species described in the genus *Leptoclinum* being attributable to either *Diplosoma* or *Didemnum* (Rowe, 1966a & b). The argument followed the course that of six species originally described in the genus *Leptoclinum* by Milne Edwards, 1841, four species had subsequently been referred to the genus *Didemnum* by Hartmeyer, 1909; that of the remaining two species included in *Leptoclinum,* (since *gelatinosum* had been placed in the synonymy of *listerianum* by Lahille, 1890), Hartmeyer, 1909, had implied that by elimination *listerianum* would be the type species of *Leptoclinum*; that although Lahille, 1890, had considered *Diplosoma rayneri* both conspecific and congeneric with *listerianum,* referring *listerianum* then to the genus *Diplosoma.* I agreed with Hartmeyer who correctly treated *Diplosoma* as a junior synonym of *Leptoclinum*; that Hartmeyer later (1915) reversed this generic synonymy on the grounds of the greater usage of the name *Diplosoma*; that although the majority of authors subsequently adopted this attitude, others were divided in the use of the names *Diplosoma* and *Leptoclinum,* thus compounding a confused situation.

2. Subsequent to my submission Mather (=Kott), 1969, though supporting the case for the suppression of *Leptoclinum*, believed that I had argued for the validation of *L. listerianum* as the type species of *Diplosoma.* Indeed this was not the case. I proposed, since I was seeking only to validate the generic name *Diplosoma*, to suppress *Leptoclinum* but retain the species *listerianum.* In this event if the synonymy of *rayneri* with *listerianum* is accepted, (Dr Kott (=Mather) has recently accepted this synonymy (1981)) then *listerianum* becomes the valid name of the type species of *Diplosoma* provided *Leptoclinum* is suppressed. Such was the argument I put forward in reply to Dr Mather's comments (Rowe, 1971).

3. Following subsequent correspondence and advice from Mr R. V. Melville, an alternative proposal to solve the problem is now submitted which would reduce the genus *Leptoclinum* Milne Edwards, 1841, to the synonymy of *Didemnum* Savigny, 1816.

4. The genus *Didemnum* was described by Savigny, 1816, with two species *candidum* and *viscosum*, neither of which was designated as the type species by Savigny. Hartmeyer, 1909, was the first author who considered it appropriate to designate *candidum* as type species of *Didemnum*. This designation has since been accepted by ascidian taxonomists. Hartmeyer, 1909, also pointed out that four species of *Leptoclinum*, namely *maculosum, asperum, durum* and *fulgens* are congeneric with *D. candidum*, a view which I fully support.

5. In view of the arguments presented before (Rowe, 1966b) and above (1,2), and in order to restrict the use of the name *Leptoclinum* in a way that further confusion can be avoided and the generic name *Diplosoma* not threatened, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Leptoclinum* Milne Edwards, 1841 and, having done so, to designate *Leptoclinum fulgens* Milne Edwards, 1841, to be the type species of that genus.

(2) to place the following generic names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:
   (a) *Diplosoma* MacDonald, 1859 (gender : neuter) type species, by monotypy, *Diplosoma rayneri* MacDonald, 1859;
   (b) *Leptoclinum* Milne Edwards, 1841 (gender : neuter) type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Leptoclinum fulgens* Milne Edwards, 1841;
   (c) *Didemnum* Savigny, 1816 (gender : neuter) type species, by subsequent designation by Hartmeyer, 1909, *Didemnum candidum* Savigny, 1816;

(3) to place the following specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
   (a) *listerianum* Milne Edwards, 1841 as published in the binomen *Leptoclinum listerianum* (the valid name at the date of this application of the type species of *Diplosoma* MacDonald, 1859);
   (b) *fulgens* Milne Edwards, 1841, as published in the binomen *Leptoclinum fulgens* (specific name of the type species of *Leptoclinum* Milne Edwards, 1841);
   (c) *candidum* Savigny, 1816, as published in the binomen *Didemnum candidum* (specific name of the type species of *Didemnum* Savigny, 1816).

REFERENCES

HARTMEYER, R. 1909. Zur terminologie der Didemnidae. *S.B. Ges. naturf. Freude Berl.* p. 575.

KOTT, P. 1981. The ascidians of the reef flats of Fiji. *Proc. Linn. Soc. N.S.W.*, vol. 105, pp. 147–212, 44 figs. 2 tables.

LAHILLE, A. 1890. *Recherches sur des Tuniciers des côtes de France*. Toulouse, 330 pp, 177 figs.

MATHER, P. 1969. Comments on the proposed validation of *Diplosoma* MacDonald, 1859. *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 25, pp. 131–132.

MILNE EDWARDS, M. H. 1841. Observations sur les ascidies composées des côtes de la Manche. *Mém. Acad. Sci. Inst. France* vol. 18, pp. 217–326, plates 1–8.

ROWE, F. W. E. 1966a. A review of the genus *Diplosoma* MacDonald, 1859, (Ascidiacea, Didemnidae) with a description of the proposed neotype of *Diplosoma listerianum* (Milne-Edwards), 1841. *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.*, (13), vol. 9, pp. 457–467, 5 figs.

—— 1966b. *Diplosoma* MacDonald, 1859 (Ascidiacea): Proposed validation under the plenary powers. *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 23, pp. 245–252.

—— 1971. The proposed designation of *Leptoclinum listerianum* Milne-Edwards as type species of *Diplosoma* MacDonald (Ascidiacea). *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 28, p. 73.

SAVIGNY, M. J. C. L. DE 1816. *Mémoires sur les animaux sans vertèbres*, part 2. Paris, 239 pp. 24 plates.

DRYMUS RYEII DOUGLAS & SCOTT, 1865 (HEMIPTERA, LYGAEIDAE): PROPOSED RATIFICATION OF THE STATUS OF A LECTOTYPE WITH A REQUEST TO SET THE NEOTYPE ASIDE. Z.N.(S.)1214

By L. Jessop (*Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD U.K.*)

In their monograph of British Heteroptera, Douglas & Scott, 1865 (p. 197) described a new variety of *Drymus sylvaticus* (Fabricius, 1794) which they named *ryeii*. Douglas & Scott stated that the variety was 'first given to us by Mr E. C. Rye', but locality data were not given. No holotype was designated.

2. In his review of the genus *Drymus* Fieber, 1860 (date *teste* Kirkaldy, 1908, p. 189) in Britain, Le Quesne, 1956 (p. 338) considered *ryeii* to be a species distinct from *sylvaticus*. Le Quesne looked for Douglas & Scott's specimens at the British Museum (Natural History) and at the University Museum, Oxford and failing to locate original type material he designated a male specimen in the British Museum (Natural History) as neotype. At that time there was no indication of any of Douglas & Scott's Heteroptera collection being located elsewhere (*vide* Horn & Kahle, 1935–1937, pp. 60, 253, 333).

3. Following the publication of Hancock & Pettitt's (1979) list of collections and collectors in North West England I realised that part of Scott's Heteroptera is now located in Bolton Museum, and borrowed from there material agreeing with original description of *Drymus ryeii*. The material comprises two males glued side-by-side on a single card on the reverse of which is written in pencil 'E.C.R.[i.e.E.C.Rye] 3/4/63 Croydon'. The card is pinned, the pin bearing the labels 'J SCOTT J SCOTT' and 'Drymus sylvaticus Fab var ryei' [sic].

4. I here designate the specimen on the left of the card, in caudal view, as lectotype. Both lectotype and paralectotype are conspecific with the neotype.

5. In compliance with Article 75f of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature I am referring this rediscovery of the original type specimens to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to:

(1) set aside the neotype designated by Le Quesne, 1956;

(2) place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the name *ryeii* Douglas & Scott, 1865, as published in the trinomen *Drymus sylvaticus ryeii* and as defined by reference to the lectotype designated herein.

REFERENCES

DOUGLAS, J. W. & SCOTT, J. 1865. *The British Hemiptera. vol. 1. Hemiptera Heteroptera.* Ray Society, London. xii—627 pp.

HANCOCK, E. G. & PETTITT, C. W. (Eds.) 1979. *Collections and Collectors in N.W. England.* Manchester Museum. 2 volumes.

HORN, W. & KAHLE, I. 1935–1937. Uber entomologische Sammlungen, Entomologen & Entomo-Museologie. *Entomol. Berh. Berlin-Dahlem* vol. 2–4, 536 pp.

LE QUESNE, W. J. 1956. An examination of the British species of *Drymus* Fieber (Hem. Lygaeidae) with a new subgenus and an addition and a generic reassignment in the British List. *Entomol. mon. Mag.* vol. 92, pp. 337–341.

KIRKALDY, G. W. 1908. Bibliographical and nomenclatorial notes on the Hemiptera. No. 9. *Entomol.* vol. 41, pp. 188–189.

APHODIUS RUFUS MOLL, 1782 AND *AEGIALIA RUFA* FABRICIUS, 1792 (INSECTA, COLEOPTERA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS BY SUPPRESSION OF *APHODIUS SCYBALARIUS* FABRICIUS, 1792.Z.N.(S.)2318

By Zdzislawa Stebnicka (*Institute of Systematic and Experimental Zoology, Polish Academy of Sciences, 31–016 Krakow, Poland*)

In 1781 J. Ch. Fabricius (*Spec. Ins.* vol. 1, p. 16) described a species called *Scarabaeus scybalarius*, included now in the genus *Aphodius* Illiger, 1798, (subfamily APHODIINAE, tribe APHODIINI).

2. C. E. v. Moll, 1782 (in Fuessly, *Neues Mag.* vol. 1, p. 372) described the same taxon as *Scarabaeus rufus*, included now in the genus *Aphodius* Illiger, 1798.

3. Thus, the priority belongs to Fabricius's specific name *scybalarius* (1781) before *rufus* Moll (1782).

4. In 1783 Herbst (*Arch. Inst.-Gesch.* vol. 4, p. 7) described another new species called *Scarabaeus foetidus*, included now in the genus *Aphodius* Illiger, 1798. The type specimen is deposited in the Zoological Museum, Kiel.

5. A number of authors in nearly all fundamental works on the systematics of the SCARABAEIDAE in the 19th and 20th centuries have erroneously used the name *Aphodius scybalarius* for Herbst's species *foetidus*, and the name *Aphodius rufus* Moll for Fabricius's *scybalarius*.

6. The proof of synonymy between *Scarabaeus scybalarius* and *S. rufus*, as well as of the misinterpretation of *S. foetidus*, was presented by Landin (1956) on the strength of authentic material deposited in the Zoological Museum, Kiel and the British Museum (Natural History) Banks Collection, London. Landin applied the Law of Priority for *Aphodius foetidus* (Herbst), reinstating this name and placing *A. scybalarius* auct. (nec Fabricius, 1781) in its synonymy. However, he proposed inconsistently to conserve the commonly used name *A. rufus* (Moll) for the species *A. scybalarius* (Fabricius), but no application to the Commission was made by him.

7. In 1792 J.Ch. Fabricius (*Ent. Syst.* vol. 1, p. 39) described another new taxon under the name *Scarabaeus rufus*, included now in the genus *Aegialia* Latreille, 1807 (subfamily APHODIINAE, tribe AEGIALIINI). *Scarabaeus rufus* Fabricius, 1792 is the type species of the subgenus *Rhysothorax* Bedel, 1911 (*Fn. Col. Seine, Scarab.*, p. 44) by original designation. *Aegialia (Rhysothorax) rufa* (Fabricius) occurs in Europe and North America. In 1977 Z. Stebnicka listed 24 references to the use of the name *rufa* or *rufus* during the years 1801–1976, established a single synonym (*Aegialia spissipes* Leconte, 1878, *Proc. Amer. phil. Soc.* vol. 17, p. 611) and recorded two uses of this name (in 1887 and 1931).

8. It should be noted that the earlier name of *Scarabaeus rufus* de Geer, 1778 (*Mém. Hist. Ins.* vol. 8, p. 640) is of uncertain status and no action on it is proposed.

9. In 1977 H. Silfverberg observed the homonymy of the species mentioned above. He introduced *Aegialia rufina* nom. nov. as a replacement name for *Aegialia rufa* (Fabricius) (suitable synonym: *Aegialia spissipes* Leconte) and close to *Aphodius rufus* (Moll) he added the following remarks: 'Landin (1956) wanted to preserve the well-known name *Aphodius rufus*, although *Aphodius scybalarius* (Fabricius, 1781) is a senior synonym (described as *Scarabaeus scybalarius* in *Spec. Ins.* vol. I, p. 16). Because of the homonymy involved, this cannot be, and *Aphodius scybalarius* is the valid name'.

10. The action of Silfverberg is very unfortunate (although compatible with the Code) and disrupts stability of nomenclature. Therefore, to avoid the confusion resulting from upsetting the long-accepted names and in the interest of stability and uniformity of nomenclature the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is hereby requested to:

(1) use its plenary powers:
  (a) to suppress the specific name *scybalarius* Fabricius, 1781 as published in the binomen *Scarabaeus scybalarius* for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;
  (b) to exempt the junior primary homonym *Scarabaeus rufus* Fabricius, 1792, from the application of the Law of Homonymy;

(2) place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
  (a) *rufus* Moll, 1782, as published in the binomen *Scarabaeus rufus*;
  (b) *rufus* Fabricius, 1792, as published in the binomen *Scarabaeus rufus*;
  (c) *foetidus* Herbst, 1782, as published in the binomen *Scarabaeus foetidus*;

(3) place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Names in Zoology *scybalarius* Fabricius, 1781, as published in the bimomen *Scarabaeus scybalarius* and as suppressed in 1(a) above.

REFERENCES

LANDIN, B. O. 1956. The Fabrician Species of Aphodiini and Aegialiini (Col., Lamellicornia). *Opusc. Entomol.* vol. 21, pp. 203–228.

SILFVERBERG, H. 1977. Nomenclatoric notes on Coleoptera Polyphaga. *Notulae Entomol.* vol. 57, pp. 91–94.

STEBNICKA, Z. 1977. A Revision of the World Species of the Tribe Aegialiini (Coleoptera, Scarabaeidae, Aphodiinae). *Acta. zool. cracov.* vol. 22, pp. 397–505.

PROPOSED USE OF PLENARY POWERS TO CONSERVE CERTAIN JUNIOR SYNONYMS IN THE FAMILY PYGOPIDAE (BRACHIOPODA). Z.N.(S.)2300

By Frank A. Middlemiss (*Department of Geography and Earth Science, Queen Mary College, University of London, Mile End Road, London E1 4NS U.K.*)

The purpose of the present application is to request the Commission to use its plenary powers in the interests of nomenclatural stability by establishing *Terebratula triangulus* Valenciennes in Lamarck, 1819, *Terebratula diphya* von Buch, 1834, *Terebratula catulloi* Pictet, 1867 and *Terebratula janitor* Pictet, 1867 as the nomenclaturally valid names of their respective species.

2. Buckman's 1906 paper on brachiopod homoeomorphy needs to be mentioned at the outset. Buckman's concept of a species in this paper was an extremely narrow one, leading him to require a specific name for almost every small shape variation. Consequently he considerably confused the nomenclatural issue by recognizing as separate and valid every name that had ever been given to a pygopid brachiopod.

A. *Terebratula triangulus* Valenciennes *in* Lamarck, 1819.

3. Bruguière, 1792, p. 424, named and figured a brachiopod as *Terebratula pileus*. In 1797 (pl. 241, fig. 1 a–c) he reproduced the figure but without a specific name. Valenciennes, in Lamarck, 1819, p. 250, presumably in ignorance of Bruguière's 1792 paper, gave the name *Terebratula triangulus* to the 1797 figure. *Terebratula pileus* Bruguière, 1792 is therefore a senior objective synonym of *Terebratula triangulus* Valenciennes, 1819.

4. Parkinson, 1811, figured as *Terebratulites triquetrus*, two specimens, one of which (p. 229, pl. 16, fig. 8) is undoubtedly conspecific with *T. pileus* Bruguière. The synonymy of *T. triquetrus* Parkinson with *T. pileus* Bruguière was recognized by Buckman, 1906 and Jarre, 1962. The synonymy of *T. triquetrus* Parkinson with *T. triangulus* Valenciennes was recognized by Davidson, 1850, Pictet, 1867, Buckman, 1906 and Jarre, 1962. *Terebratulites triquetrus* Parkinson, 1811 pars, is therefore a senior subjective synonym of *Terebratula triangulus* Valenciennes, 1819.

5. The specific name *triquetrus* has not been used as the valid specific name by any author except Buckman, 1906; *pileus* has been used only by Bronn, 1849 and Buckman, 1906. The great majority of authors have used *triangulus*. In the fifty years 1928–1978 no use of either *triquetrus* or *pileus* has been discovered, while authors using *triangulus* as the valid name during that period include: Fallot, 1934; Roman, 1936; Goĉanin, 1938; Trauth, 1948; Jarre, 1962; Fülop, 1964; Geyssant, 1966; Vogel, 1966; Ager, 1975, and Nowak, 1976.

B. *Terebratula diphya* von Buch, 1834

6. *Concha diphya* Fabius Columna, 1606, has been taken by most authors to denote the central specific concept among the PYGOPIDAE. This name, however, is pre-Linnean and it is, in any case, difficult to decide what species Columna's figure (1606, p. 36) is intended to depict. The earliest post-Linnean author to use the name was von Buch, 1834, as *Terebratula diphya* (p. 88; pl. 1, fig. 12). However there were earlier post-Linnean names for the species. Parkinson, 1811, p. 229; pl. 16, fig. 4, under the name *Terebratulites triquetrus*, figured a specimen which could well be of this species, in addition to the specimen referred to in the previous section. Valenciennes, in Lamarck, 1819, p. 250, gave the name *Terebratula deltoidea* to an unnamed figure published by Bruguière, 1797, pl. 240, fig. 4. Catullo, 1827, p. 169, pl. 5, figs. p, r, s, t. gave the name *Terebratula antinomia* to what is probably the same species (the figures are poor). It is clear that von Buch intended his *Terebratula diphya* 1834 to denote the same species as *Concha diphya* Columna and *Terebratula deltoidea* Valenciennes, since in 1834 he reproduced Columna's figure and cited *T. deltoidea* Lamarck in synonymy, while in his 1838 paper (p. 196, pl. 18, fig 9) he reproduced as *T. diphya* Bruguière's 1797 figure upon which Valenciennes had based *deltoidea*. *T. deltoidea* Valenciennes, 1819 can thus claim to be a senior objective synonym of *T. diphya* von Buch, 1834 and a senior subjective synonym of *T. antinomia* Catullo, 1827. Von Buch presumably considered *diphya* to have priority. These synonymies were all recognized by Pictet, 1867, who nevertheless employed *diphya* as the valid name. *Terebratulites triquetrus* Parkinson, 1811, pars is a senior subjective synonym of *Terebratula diphya* von Buch, 1834.

7. Apart from Buckman, 1906, p. 445, few authors have used any other names but *diphya* for this species. Catullo, 1841, p. 238, pl. 2, fig. 3; 1851, p. 75, fig. 3, and Zejszner, 1846, p. 24, used *deltoidea*, but the vast majority of authors have continued to use *diphya*. In the fifty years 1928–1978 authors who have used *diphya* as the valid name include: Gerber, 1930; Fallot, 1931 & 1934; Lacoste, 1934; Dalloni, 1936 & 1952; Marçais & van Leckwijck, 1936; Calembert, 1937 & 1952; Rod, 1946; Trauth, 1948; Glaçon, 1952; Gignoux, 1955; Kotanski & Radwanski, 1959; Christ, 1960; Jarre, 1962; Birkenmajer, 1963; Hölder, 1964; Geyssant, 1966; Vogel, 1966; Barczyk, 1972; Desio, 1973 and Ager, 1975. Ager, 1975, p. 156, used both *diphya* and *deltoidea* in a manner which implies uncertainty about validity, presumably in the light of Muir-Wood's action discussed below.

8. The name *deltoidea* could be safely regarded as in complete disuse but for Muir-Wood's resurrection of it in the Treatise (1965, p.H 802) with the clear intention of establishing it as the valid name of the species. It appears desirable to conserve the name *diphya*; (a) because of its great historic interest as being by far the oldest brachiopod specific name still in common use (and possibly with its original connotation), and (b) because its long-continued employment by the great majority of authors as the valid name would be succeeded by nomenclatural confusion if it were now to be replaced by *deltoidea*.

C. *Terebratula catulloi* Pictet, 1867

9. Catullo, 1851, p. 75, fig. 4, established a species *Antinomia dilatata*. Pictet, 1867, p. 171, pls. 32, 33, redescribed *dilatata*, using Catullo's specific name, but decided against adopting his generic name and called the species *Terebratula dilatata*. Later (1867, p. 202) Pictet realised that he had created a secondary homonym of *Terebratula dilatata* Lamarck and *Terebratula dilatata* Sowerby, so he changed the name of the species to *Terebratula catulloi*. Since this change of name, however unnecessary it may have been, was made before 1961, the name *catulloi* must, under Article 59b (i), be accepted as the valid name of the species unless it can be shown to be contrary to existing usage.

10. However there are earlier names which are believed to refer to this species. Authors who have considered the matter have taken *A. dilatata* Catullo, 1851 to be synonymous with *Terebratula antinomia* Catullo, 1829, p. 317, pl. 5, fig. 5 (Jarre, 1962, p. 58) and *T. catulloi* Pictet, 1867 to be synonymous with *T. antinomia* Catullo, 1829 (and 1841, p. 237, pl. 2, fig. 2, a reproduction of the 1829 figure) (Buckman, 1906, Jarre, 1962). Still earlier, Bruguière, 1792, p. 425, figured as *Terebratula cor* a specimen which is probably the same species (Buckman, 1906, p. 442, Jarre, 1962, p. 58). *Terebratula cor* Bruguière 1792 and *Terebratula antinomia* Catullo, 1829 are therefore senior subjective synonyms of *Terebratula catulloi* Pictet, 1867.

11. *Terebratula cor* Bruguière and *Terebratula antinomia* Catullo are completely forgotten names. Catullo, 1827, pl. 5, figs. p, r, s, t, had also used *Terebratula antinomia* for a form which Jarre, 1962 and the present author have considered the same as von Buch's *Terebratula diphya*; another case of subjective synonymy which threatens nomenclatural stability. As to whether *dilatata* or *catulloi* constitutes the name in existing usage, the position is that during the fifty years 1928–1978 Jarre, 1962; Muir-Wood, 1965; Geyssant, 1966; Vogel, 1966 and Ager, 1975 have used *catulloi*, while Fallot, 1931 & 1934; Fülop, 1964 and Hölder, 1964 have used *dilatata*. There seems to be no case for claiming that Article 59b (i) should be set aside by existing usage. It should be noted that *Terebratula cor* Valenciennes in Lamarck, 1819 is a completely different species from its senior homonym *Terebratula cor* Bruguière, 1792. Davidson, 1850 examined the type specimen of the former and considered it to be synonymous with *Terebratula numismalis* Valenciennes in Lamarck, 1819. *T. numismalis* was made type species of the genus *Cincta* Quenstedt by Dall, 1877, p. 20 by subsequent designation.

D. *Terebratula janitor* Pictet, 1867

12. The only threat to the stability of this name arises from Buckman's resurrection (Buckman 1906, p. 446) of the name *Terebratula duvalii* Newman, 1844. That this is a senior subjective synonym of *T. janitor* Pictet, 1867 was recognized by Buckman, 1906, as regards at least one of Pictet's figured specimens. Jarre, 1962 and the present author agree that the two species are one and the same. Apart from Buckman's reference no

author has used *duvalii*. Authors who have employed *janitor* as the valid name for this species during the fifty years 1928–78 include, among many others: Gerber, 1930; Fallot, 1931 & 1934; Lacoste, 1934; Marçais & van Leckwijck, 1936; Goĉanin, 1938; Rod, 1946; Dalloni, 1952; Glaçon, 1952 and Hölder, 1964.

E. Conclusions

13. In order to establish *Terebratula triangulus* Valenciennes, 1819, *Terebratula diphya* von Buch, 1834, *Terebratula catulloi* Pictet, 1867, and *Terebratula janitor* Pictet, 1867, as the nomenclaturally valid names for their respective species, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is hereby asked:

(a) to use its plenary powers

(i) to suppress for the purposes of the Law of Priority, but not for those of the Law of Homonymy, the specific names (1) *pileus* Bruguière, 1792, as published in the binomen *Terebratula pileus*, and (2) *deltoidea* Valenciennes in Lamarck, 1819, as published in the binomen *Terebratula deltoidea*;

(ii) to suppress the specific name *cor* Bruguière, 1792, as published in the binomen *Terebratula cor*, for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy;

(iii) in each of the following cases to give nomenclatural precedence to the junior name over the senior name whenever the two are regarded as synonyms:

(1) *Terebratula triangulus* Valenciennes in Lamarck, 1819, over *Terebratulites triquetrus* Parkinson, 1811;

(2) *Terebratula diphya* von Buch, 1834 over *Terebratulites triquetrus* Parkinson, 1811, and *Terebratula antinomia* Catullo, 1827;

(3) *Terebratula catulloi* Pictet, 1867 over *Terebratula antinomia* Catullo, 1827;

(4) *Terebratula janitor* Pictet, 1867 over *Terebratula duvalii* Newman, 1844;

(b) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology

(i) the specific name *triangulus* Valenciennes, 1819, as published in the binomen *Terebratula triangulus*;

(ii) the specific name *diphya* von Buch, 1834, as published in the binomen *Terebratula diphya*;

(iii) the specific name *catulloi* Pictet, 1867, as published in the binomen *Terebratula catulloi*;

(iv) the specific name *janitor* Pictet, 1867, as published in the binomen *Terebratula janitor*

each with an endorsement that it is to be given nomenclatural precedence over its senior synonym or synonyms mentioned in (v) to (vii) below;

(v) the specific name *triquetrus* Parkinson, 1811, as published in the binomen *Terebratulites triquetrus*;

(vi) the specific name *antinomia* Catulloi, 1826, as published in the binomen *Terebratula antinomia*;

(vii) the specific name *duvalii* Newman, 1844, as published in the binomen *Terebratula duvalii*

each with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over its junior synonym or synonyms mentioned in (1) to (iv) above;

(c) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology

(i) *pileus* Bruguière, 1792, as published in the binomen *Terebratula pileus* and

(ii) *deltoidea* Valenciennes in Lamarck, 1819, as published in the binomen *Terebratula deltoidea*

both as suppressed under the plenary powers in (a) (i) above;

(iii) *cor* Bruguière, 1792, as published in the binomen *Terebratula cor*, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (a) (ii) above.

REFERENCES

AGER, D. V. 1975. Brachiopods at the Jurassic-Cretaceous boundary. *Mém. B.R.G.M.*, no. 86.

BARCZYCK, W. 1972. Some representatives of the family Pygopidae (Brachiopoda) from the Tithonian of the Pieniny Klippen Belt. *Acta geol. polonica.* vol. 22, pp. 507–513, pl. 1–4.

BIRKENMAJER, K. 1963. Stratigraphy and palaeontology of the Czorsztyn Series (Pieniny Klippen Belt, Carpathians, Poland). *Stud. geol. polonica.* vol. 9, pp. 1–380.

BRONN, H. G. 1849. *Index Palaeontologicus*, pp. 1059–1245.

BRUGUIÈRE, J. G. 1792. Sur deux nouvelles espèces de térébratules fossiles. *Choix des mémoires sur divers objets d'hist. nat. formant les collections du Journ. d'Hist. nat.*, vol. 1, pp. 419–427.

——— 1797. *Tableau et encyclopedie méthodique des trois règnes de la nature*, vol. 2.

BUCH, L. VON 1834. *Über Terebrateln.* 124 pp., 3 pl., *Abhandl. k. Akad. Wissensch.* Berlin.

——— 1838. Essai d'une classification et d'une déscription des térébratules. *Mém. Soc. géol. France.*, vol. 3, pp. 105–238.

BUCKMAN, S. S. 1906. Brachiopod homoeomorphy: *Pygope, Antinomia, Pygites. Quart. J. geol. Soc. Lond.*, vol. 62, pp. 433–454, pl. 41.

CALEMBERT, L. 1937. Sur la stratigraphie du massif de l'Ouarsenis. *Ann. Soc. géol. Belg.*, vol. 60, pp. B208–B221.

——— 1952. Etude géologique du massif culminant de l'Ouarsenis. *Bull. Serv. Carte géol. Algérie.*, 2e ser., no. 23, pp. 1–184.

CATULLO, T. A. 1827. *Saggio di Zoologia Fossile*, 348 pp., 8 pl., Dalla Tipografia del Seminaria. Padua.

——— 1829. Sopra alcuni terreni adeguabili alla formazione di sedimento inferiore delle Provincie Austro-Venete, e sopra varie specie fossili trovate nel terreno di sedimento medio. *Ann. di Storia nat.*, fasc. 3, pp. 297–318, pl. 5.

——— 1841. Osservazioni geonostico-zoologiche. *Nuovi Saggi della Acad. Sci. Lett. Arti.*, vol. 5 (for 1840), pp. 217–242, pls 1, 2.

——— 1851. On the Epiolitic Rocks of the Venetian Alps. *Quart. J. geol. Soc. London*, vol. 7, pp. 66–76.

CHRIST, H. A. 1960. Beiträge zur Stratigraphie und Paläontologie des Malm von Westsizilien. *Schweiz. paläeont. Abh.* vol. 77, pp. 1–141, 9 pl.

COLUMNA, F. 1606. *Minus Cognitarum Stirpium aliquot, ac etiam rariorum nostro coelo orientium.* 340 pp. Rome.

DALLONI, M. 1936. Matériaux pour l'étude géologique du Massif de l'Ouarsenis. *Bull. Serv. Carte, géol. Algérie*, 2e ser., no. 13, pp. 1–41.

——— 1952. *L'Atlas tellien occidental.* 19th Int. geol. Cong., Mon reg., 1e ser., no. 24, pp. 1–99.

DAVIDSON, T. 1850. Notes on an examination of Lamarck's species of fossil Terebratulae. *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.*, (2), vol. 5, pp. 433–449.

DESIO, A. ed. 1973. *Geologia dell'Italia.* 1081 pp. Unione Tipografico Editrice Torinese, Turin.

FALLOT, P. 1931. Contribution à l'étude du Jarassique supérieur subbétique. *Bol. r. Soc. esp. Hist. nat.*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 113–132, 1 pl.

——— 1934. Essais sur la répartition des terrains secondaires et tertiaires dans le domaine des Alpides espagnoles. *Assoc. Et. Géol. Med. occid.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pt. 2, pp. 75–118.

FÜLOP, J. 1964. A Bakonyhegyseg Also-Kreta (Berriazi-Apti) Kepzodmenyei. *Geol. Hung.*, vol. 13, pp. 1–194, pl. 1–31.

GERBER, M. 1930. Beiträge zur Stratigraphie der Jura-Kreidegrenze in der Zentralschweiz. *Ec. Geol. Helv.*, vol. 23, pp. 497–547.

GEYSSANT, J. 1966. Étude paléontologique des faunes du Jurassique supérieur de la zone prérifaine du Moyen Ouerrha. 1. *Glossothyris* et *Pygope* (Terebratulidae), essai de répartition de ces espèces dans le domaine méditerranéen. *Notes Serv. Géol. Maroc.*, vol. 26, no. 188, pp. 75–98, pl. 1–3.

GIGNOUX, M. 1955. *Stratigraphic Geology* (English ed.) W. H. Freeman & Co., San Francisco.

GLAÇON, J. 1952. Les Monts du Hodna. *19th Int. Geol. Cong.*, Mon. reg., 1e ser., no. 7, pp. 1–89.

GOČANIN, M. 1938. Über die fossilführenden Schichten Kimmeridgien, Tithon, Valanginien und Hauterive aus der Umgebung von Beograd. *Vesnik geol. Inst. Kralj. Jugoslavije*, vol. 6, pp. 35–71, pls 1, 2.

HÖLDER, H. 1964. Jura: *in* F. Lotze ed. *Handbuch der stratigraphischen Geologie*, vol. 4, 603 pp. Ferdinand Enke Verlag., Stuttgart.

JARRE, P. 1962. Révision du genre *Pygope*. *Trav. Lab. Géol. Grenoble*, vol. 38, pp. 23–120.

KOTANSKI, Z. & RADWANSKI, A. 1959. Fauna z *Pygope diphya* i limburgity w tytonie wierchowym Osobitej. *Acta. geol. polonica*, vol. 9, pp. 519–534, pl. 53–56.

LACOSTE, J. 1934. Études géologiques dans le Rif méridional. *Notes et Mém. Serv. Mines et Géol. Maroc*, no. 31, 660 pp., 36 pl.

LAMARCK, J. DE 1819. *Histoire naturelle des Animaux sans Vertèbres*, vol. 6, pt. 1. J. B. Baillière. Paris, London.

MARÇAIS, J. & LECKWIJCK, W. VAN. 1936. Sur des affleurements du Jurassique supérieur dans le Rif oriental (Maroc). *C. R. Soc. géol. France*, 17/2/26, pp. 60–62.

MUIR-WOOD, H. M. 1965. *in* Moore, R. C. ed. *Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology:* pt. H (Brachiopoda). University of Kansas Press, New York.

NEWMAN, E. 1844. Note on Duval's fossil *Terebratula. Zoologist,* vol. 2, pp. 679–680.

NOWAK, W. A. 1976. *Parastomiosphaera malmica* from the Polish Carpathians . . . *Roczn. Polsk. Tow. geol.*, vol. 46, pp. 89–134.

PARKINSON, J. 1811. *Organic Remains of a Former World*, vol. 3, 455 pp., 22 pl. Sherwood, Neely and Jones. London.

PICTET, F-J. 1867. Étude monographique des Térebratules du groupe de la *Terebratula diphya. Mélanges paléontol.*, vol. 3, pp. 135–184, pl. 29–34.

ROD, E. 1946. Über ein Fossillager im oberen Malm der Melchtaleralpen. *Ec. Geol. Helv.*, vol. 39, pp. 177–198, pls 13, 14.

ROMAN, F. 1936. Le Tithonique du Massif de Djurdjura. *Mat. Carte géol. Algérie,* 1e ser., no. 7. pp. 1–43.

TRAUTH, F. 1948. Die fazielle Ausbildung und Gliederung des Oberjura in den nördlichen Ostalpen. *Verh. geol. Bundesanst.*, hefte 10–12, pp. 145–218, 1 pl.

VOGEL, K. 1966. Eine funktionsmorphologische Studie an der Brachiopodengattung Pygope (*Malm* bis Unterkreide). *N. Jb. Geol. Palaont. Abh.*, vol. 125, pp. 423–442, pls 38, 39.

ZEJSZNER, L. 1846. *New and little known genera of fossils from the Tatra Mountains*, 32 pp., 4 pl., W. Drukarni Stanislawa Strabskiego. Warsaw.

DELPHINUS TRUNCATUS MONTAGU, 1821 (MAMMALIA, CETACEA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION BY SUPPRESSION OF *DELPHINUS NESARNACK* LACÉPÈDE, 1804. Z.N.(S.)2082

By Dale W. Rice (*National Marine Mammal Laboratory, 7600 Sand Point Way, Bldg. 42, Seattle, Washington 98115, U.S.A.*)

The purpose of this application is to request the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers to suppress the specific name *nesarnack* Lacépède, 1804, as published in the binomen *Delphinus nesarnack* (*Hist. nat. cétacés*, vol. 40, p. 307, pl. 15, fig. 2), and concomitantly to ensure that the specific name *truncatus* Montagu, 1821, as published in the binomen *Delphinus truncatus* (*Mem. Wernerian nat. Hist. Soc.*, vol. 3, p. 75, pl. 3) is conserved.

2. The name *Tursiops truncatus* (Montagu, 1821) has been in almost universal use for the North Atlantic bottlenose dolphin since 1903 (True, F. W. 1903. A note on the common bottlenose porpoise of the North Atlantic, *Tursiops truncatus* (Montagu) *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia*, pp. 313–314), and has been used in all of the numerous recent publications on this important species, including the following:

Corbet, G. B. & Hill, J. E. 1980. *A world list of mammalian species*. London, British Museum (Natural History)

Dailey, M. D. 1976. *J. Wildl. Dis.*, vol. 12(1), pp. 45–51

Ellerman, J. R. & Morrison-Scott, T. C. S. 1951. *Checklist of Palaearctic and Indian mammals*. London, British Museum (Natural History)

Fraser, F. C. 1974. *Report on Cetacea stranded on British coasts from 1948 to 1966*. London, British Museum (Natural History)

Hershkovitz, P. 1966. *Catalog of living whales*. Washington, Smithsonian Institution

Irvine, A. B., Scott, M. D., Wells, R. S. & Kaufman, J. H. 1981. *Fishery Bull. natn. ocean. atmos. Adm.*, vol. 79(4), pp. 671–688

Lear, R. J. & Bryden, M. M. 1980. *Aust. nat. Parks Wildl. Serv. Occas. Pap.*, vol. 4, pp. 1–25

Leatherwood, S. 1975. *Mar. Fish. Rev.*, vol. 37(9), pp. 10–16

Leatherwood, S., Deerman, M. W. & Potter, C. W. 1978. *Cetology*, vol. 28, pp. 1–6

Lock, C. 1978. *J. nat. Hist.*, vol. 12, pp. 513–528

Mitchell, E. 1975. *Porpoise, dolphin and small whale fisheries of the world*. Morges, I.U.C.N.

Purves, P. E. & van Bree, P. J. H. 1972. *Beaufortia*, vol. 20(260), pp. 15–21

Ross, G. J. B. 1977. *Ann. Cape prov. Mus.*, vol. 11(9), pp. 135–194

Sargeant, D. E., Caldwell, D. K. & Caldwell, M. C. 1973. *J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can.*, vol. 30, pp. 1009–1011

3. Hershkovitz (1961, *Fieldiana Zool.*, vol. 39(49), p. 550) regards *Delphinus nesarnack* Lacépède, 1804, as a senior subjective synonym of *Delphinus truncatus*. Therefore Hershkovitz (*op. cit.* and 1963, *J. Mammal.*, vol. 44(1), pp. 98–103) employed the name *Tursiops nesarnack* Lacépède,

1804 for the North Atlantic bottlenose dolphin. Later Hershkovitz (1966, *U.S. Natl. Mus. Bull.*, vol. 246, pp. 52–55) treated *truncatus* as a nomen conservandum. E. R. Hall (1981, *The Mammals of North America*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, p. 886) is the only subsequent author who has used *nesarnack*.

4. The type specimen of *Delphinus nesarnack* was originally deposited at the Ecole Nationale Vétérinaire d'Alfort. Dr Daniel Robineau of the Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle (Centre National d'Étude des Mammifères) has written to say that no trace of it can be found at either institution.

5. Substitution of the name *nesarnack* for *truncatus* would upset long-standing nomenclatural stability and universality for this well known species, causing confusion.

6. For the reasons listed above I now request the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature;

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the specific name *nesarnack* Lacépède, 1804, as published in the binomen *Delphinus nesarnack*, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;

(2) to place the specific name *truncatus* Montagu, 1821, as published in the binomen *Delphinus truncatus*, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *nesarnack* Lacépède, 1804, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.

INDEX TO AUTHORS

	Page
Achterberg, C. van	53
Ansell, W.F.H.	136
Archbold, N.W.	105
Baqri, Q.H.	138
Boucek, Z.	151
Boulard, M.	166
Bour, R	198
Clark, W.E.	45
Cifelli, R.L.	56
Cowan, C.F.	197, 259
Crosby, T.K.	211
Crosskey, R.W.	86
Currie, D.C.	211
Cutler, E.B.	62
Danzig, E.M.	101
Dubois, A.	198
Duellman, W.E.	122
Dupuis, C.	141
Eisenmann, E. (deceased)	240
Francke, O.F.	97
Fricke, R.	58
Gagné, R.J.	149
Heppell, D.	5
Holloway, J.D.	72
Holthuis, L.B.	72, 152
Jessop, L.	263
Kerzhner, I.M.	101, 110
Knutson, L.V.	149
Kuznetsov, V.I.	110
Lucas, S.G.	94
Lynch, J.D.	122, 187
Mayr, E.	240
Melville, R.V. (Secretary)	3, 6, 80 . . 125, 158, 163, 185, 205, 245, 250
Michener, C.D.	138
Middlemiss, F.A.	267
Moore, T.E.	207
Mroczkowski, M.	114, 116
Naumann, C.M.	73
Nelson, G.	65
Parkes, K.C.	240
Penrose, A.	119
Polhemus, J.T.	108
Rehder, H.B.	159
Rice, D.W.	274
Ride, W.D.L.	152
Rowe, F.W.E.	260
Rubtsov, I.A.	83
Sabrosky, C.W.	152, 156, 186
Schoch, R.M.	94, 208
Siddiqi, M.R.	137
Sims, R.W.	163, 254
Smith, H.M.	108, 132, 187
Soria, M.F.	56
Stebnicka, Z.	265
Stimson, A.F.	135
Taylor, P.D.	77
Thomas, G.A.	105
Thompson, F.C.	149
Tremewan, W.G.	73
Turner, J.R.G.	43, 197
Whitehead, P.J.P.	65
Williams, E.E.	132
Wood, S.L.	189

LIST OF DECISIONS IN THIS VOLUME

Opinion		*Page*
1264	*Oscinis plumigera* Loew, 1860 (Insecta, Diptera): suppressed by use of the plenary powers	8
1265	*Bellota* Peckham & Peckham, 1892 (Araneae, Salticidae): type species designated	10
1266	*Cophixalus* Boettger, 1892 (Amphibia, Salientia): type species designated	12
1267	*Muscicapa ruficauda* Swainson, 1838 (Aves, Muscicapidae): neotype designated	15
1268	*Simia leucophaeae* F. Cuvier, 1807 (Mammalia, Primates): suppression of two senior synonyms	17
1269	METRIDIIDAE Carlgren, 1893 (Anthozoa) and METRIDIIDAE Sars, 1902 (Copepoda): a ruling to eliminate the homonymy.	19
1270	*Chrysomela flavicornis* and *Chrysomela tibialis* Suffrian, 1851 (Insecta, Coleoptera): conserved	22
1271	*Polynoe* Savigny, 1818 (Annelida, Polychaeta): type species designated	24
1272	*Sciaena nibe* Jordan & Thompson, 1911 (Pisces): specific name *nibe* conserved	26
1273	*Anaspis, Luperus, Lampyris* and *Clerus* (Insecta, Coleoptera): determination of authorship and fixation of type species	28
1274	*Notonecta striata* Linnaeus, 1758 (Insecta, Hemiptera): neotype designated	32
1275	*Macrocephalites* Zittel, 1884 and *Ammonites macrocephalus* Schlotheim, 1813 (Mollusca, Cephalopoda): placed on the Official Lists	34
1276	*Semblis marginata* Panzer, 1799 (Insecta, Plecoptera): conserved	36
1277	*Ptilium* Gyllenhal, 1827 and *Ptenidium* Erichson, 1845 (Insecta, Coleoptera): conserved	212
1278	The generic name *Rhincodon* A. Smith, 1829 (Pisces): conserved	215
1279	*Chrysolina* Motschulsky, 1860 (Insecta, Coleoptera): conserved	218
1280	Rafinesque, C.S., 1822 'On the turtles of the United States': suppressed	221
1281	*Acmaea limatula* Carpenter, 1864 (Mollusca, Gastropoda): conserved	223
1282	*Panopeus* H. Milne Edwards, 1834 (Crustacea, Decapoda): designation of type species	225
1283	LYMANTRIIDAE Hampson, [1893] given nomenclatural precedence over ORGYIIDAE Wallengren, 1861 and DASYCHIRIDAE Packard, 1864 (Insecta, Lepidoptera)	227
1284	*Peggischisme* Kirkaldy, 1904 (Hemiptera, Heteroptera): designation of type species	231
1285	*Barbus altianalis* Boulenger, 1900 and *Barbus rueppelli* Boulenger, 1902 (Pisces, Cyprinidae): conserved	233
1286	*Chermes fusca* ;Zetterstedt, 1828 (Insecta, Homoptera): conserved	235
1287	*Sesia andrenaeformis* Laspeyres, 1801 (Insecta, Lepidoptera): conserved	238

Direction

114 Herrera, 1899, '*Sinonimía vulgar y científica de los principales vertebrados mexicanos*', (Mexico Officina Tipográfia de la Secretaría de Fomento) placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoology (Direction supplementary to Direction 32) 39

115 MEROPIDAE (Aves): attributed to Rafinesque, 1815 (Correction to Entry No 1 in the Official List of Family Group Names in Zoology) 41

NAMES PLACED ON OFFICIAL LISTS AND INDEXES IN DECISIONS PUBLISHED IN VOLUME 41

Official List of Specific Names in Zoology

altianalis, Barbus, Boulenger, 1900
andrenaeformis, Sesia, Laspeyres, 1801
antiqua, Phalaena, Linnaeus, 1758
apiarius, Attelabus, Linnaeus, 1758
caesum, Ptilium, Erichson, 1845
consanguinea, Davila, Distant, 1893
dorsalis, Corixa, Leach, 1817
duodecimguttata, Chrysomela, Thunberg, 1787
flavicornis, Chrysomela, Suffrian, 1851
flavipes, Chrysomela, Linnaeus, 1767
formicina, Chirothecia, Taczanowski, 1879
frontalis, Mordella, Linnaeus, 1758
fusca, Psylla, Geoffroy in Fourcroy, 1785
fusca, Chermes, Zetterstedt, 1828
herbstii, Panopeus, H. Milne Edwards, 1834
limatula, Acmaea, Carpenter, 1864
longus, Calanus, Lubbock, 1854
macrocephalus, Ammonites, Schlotheim, 1813
marginata, Semblis, Panzer, 1799
maxima, Phryganea, Scopoli, 1763
melas, Dermestes, Marsham, 1802
moluccensis, Microhyla, var. of *achatina,* Peters & Doria, 1878
monacha, Phalaena, Linnaeus, 1758
mutillarius, Clerus, Fabricius, 1775
nibe, Sciaena, Jordan & Thompson, 1911
noctiluca, Cantharis, Linnaeus, 1758
peckhami, Bellota, Galiano, 1978
populi, Chrysomela, Linnaeus, 1758
pusillum, Scaphidium, Gyllenhal, 1808
rueppelli, Barbus, Boulenger, 1902
ruficauda, Muscicapa, Swainson, 1838
scolopendrina, Polynoe, Savigny, 1822
senilis, Priapus, Linnaeus, 1761
staphylaea, Chrysomela, Linnaeus, 1758
striata, Notonecta, Linnaeus, 1758
tephra, Dasychira, Hübner, [1809]
tibialis, Chrysomela, Suffrian, 1851
typus, Rhiniodon, A. Smith, 1828
unicolor, Cyornis, Blyth, 1843
verrucosa, Sphenophryne, Boulenger, 1898
vitripennis, Perla, Burmeister, 1839

Official List of Generic Names in Zoology

Anaspis Geoffroy, 1762
Anisarthria Stephens, 1830
Atechna Chevrolat, 1837
Bellota Peckham & Peckham, 1892
Chrysolina Motschulsky, 1860
Chrysomela Linnaeus, 1758
Clerus Geoffroy, 1762
Cophixalus Boettger, 1892
Dasychira Hübner, [1809]
Lampyris Geoffroy, 1762
Luperus Geoffroy, 1762
Lymantria Hübner, [1819]
Marthàmea Klapálek, 1907
Metridia Boeck, 1865
Metridium Blainville, 1824
Oreophryne Boettger, 1895
Orgyia Ochsenheimer, 1810
Panopeus H. Milne Edwards, 1834
Peggichisme Kirkaldy, 1904
Polynoe Savigny, 1818
Ptenidium Erichson, 1845
Ptilium Gyllenhal, 1827
Rhincodon A. Smith, 1829
Trichodes Herbst, 1792

Official List of Family Group Names in Zoology

DASYCHIRIDAE Packard, 1864
ORGYIIDAE Wallengren, 1861
LYMANTRIIDAE Hampson [1893]
RHINCODONTIDAE Müller & Henle, 1841
MEROPIDAE Rafinesque, 1815
METRIDINIDAE Sars, 1902
METRIDIIDAE Carlgren, 1893

Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology

anthraciniformis, Sphinx, Esper, 1798
brunneolus, Pseudotolithus, Jordan & Richardson, 1909
flavicornis, Chrysomela, Fabricius, 1787
mamillata, Patella, Reeve, 1855
marginata, Semblis, Fabricius, 1793
plumigera, Oscinis, Loew, 1860
rueppellii, Labeo, Pfeffer, 1896
silvestris, Simia, Schreber, [1800]
sylvestris, Simia, Link, 1795
tibialis, Chrysomela, Duftschmid 1825

Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology

Laria Schrank, 1802
Liparis Ochsenheimer, 1810
Rhiniodon A. Smith, 1828

Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family Group Names in Zoology

LARIIDAE Newman, 1832
LIPARIDAE Boisduval, 1834
METRIDIIDAE Sars, 1902

Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoology

A. L. Herrera	*Sinonimía vulgar y científica de los principales vertebrados mexicanos* (Mexico, Officina Tipográfia de la Secretaría de Fomento, 31 pp.) 1899.
C. S. Rafinesque	*On the turtles of the United States,* (*Kentucky Gazette,* (n.s.1), vol. 36, no. 21, 23 May, 1822).

INDEX TO KEY NAMES

	Page
achatina var. *moluccensis, Microhyla,* Peters & Doria, 1878 Opinion 1266)	12
ADIANTHIDAE Ameghino, 1891	208
Allerya Mörch, 1877	159
alphaeus, Papilio, Cramer, [1777]	120
altianalis, Barbus, Boulenger, 1900 (Opinion 1285)	233
Alyattes Kinberg 1867	235
Anaspis Geoffroy, 1762 (Opinion 1273)	28
andrenaeformis, Sesia, Laspeyres, 1801 (Opinion 1287)	238
Anisarthria Stephens, 1830	212
Anolis Daudin,1802	132
anthraciniformis, Sphinx, Esper, 1798 (Opinion 1287)	238
anthyllidis,Lycastes, Hübner, [1819]	73
anthyllidis,Zygaena, Boisduval, [1828]	73
antiqua, Phalaena, Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1283)	227
Apeistus Motschulsky, 1840	117
apiarius,Attelabus, Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1273)	29
apii, Alysia, Curtis, 1826	54
APISTINI Ganglbauer, 1899	116
armata, Metridia, Boeck, 1865 (Opinion 1269)	19
Astacilla Cordiner, 1793	72
Atechna Chevrolat, 1837 (Opinion 1279)	218
bahiensis, Pellonula, Steindachner, 1879	65
Bellota Peckham & Peckham, 1892 (Opinion 1265)	10
bergstraesserella, Tinea, Fabricius, 1781	250
bilineatus, Polygnatus, Roundy, 1926	205
boreale, Cardium, Broderip & Sowerby, 1829	5
brevis crassus, Democricetodon, Freudenthal, 1969	246
Brondelia Bourguignat, 1862	160
brunneolus, Pseudotolithus, Jordan & Richardson, 1909 (Opinion 1272)	26
bucatus, Adianthus, Ameghino, 1891	56, 208
bullaris, Lacerta, Linnaeus, 1758	132
Caecilia Linnaeus, 1758	109
CAECILIAIDAE (ex CAECILIADAE) Gray, 1825	109
CAECILIIDAE (ex CAECILIINI) Kolbe, 1880	109, 207
caesum, Ptilium, Erichson, 1845 (Opinion 1277)	212
californiense, Cardium, Deshayes, 1839	5
Callitroga Brauer, 1883	125
candidum, Didemnum, Savigny, 1816	261
Capys Hewitson, 1865	119, 197
carolinensis, Anolis, Voigt, 1832	132
catulloi, Terebratula, Pictet, 1867	267
chlorographa,Leptosia, Hübner, 1818	259
Choerodes Leidy, 1852	94
Choeropsis Leidy, 1852	94

Chrysolina Motschulsky, 1860 (Opinion 1279) 218
Chrysomela Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1279) 218
Cicada Linnaeus, 1758 163
CICADIDAE Berthold, 1827 180
CICADINAE Berthold, 1827 164
ciliatum, Cardium, Fabricius, 1780 5
cinerascens, Curculio, Marsham, 1802 46
Clerus Geoffroy, 1762 (Opinion 1273) 28
Cochliomyia Townsend, 1915 125
complanatus, Lumbricus, Dugès, 1828 254
cor, Terebratula, Bruguière, 1792 270
Cophixalus Boettger, 1892 (Opinion 1266) 12
consanguinea, Davila, Distant, 1893 (Opinion 1284) 231
corollana, Tortrix, Hübner, 1823 111
crassicaudatus, Galago, E. Geoffroy, 1812 136
crassus, Democricetodon, Freudenthal, 1969 248
Crinodes Herrich-Schäffer, 1855 72
cumanense, Siphonosoma, Keferstein, 1867 62

Dapsilarthra Foerster, 1862 53
Dasychira Hübner, [1809] (Opinion 1283) 227
DASYCHIRIDAE Packard, 1864 (Opinion 1283) 227
deltoidea, Terebratula, Valenciennes in Lamarck, 1819 268
Democricetodon Fahlbusch, 1964 245
dianthus, Actinia, Ellis, 1768 (Opinion 1269) 19
Didemnum Savigny, 1816 260
diphya, Terebratula, von Buch, 1834 267
Diplosoma MacDonald, 1859 260
dorsalis, Corixa, Leach, 1817 (Opinion 1274) 32
Drymus Fieber, 1860 263
duodecimguttata, Chrysomela Thunberg, 1787 (Opinion 1279) . . . 218

edule, Siphonosoma, (Pallas, 1774) 62
edulis, Lumbricus, Pallas, 1774 62
erato, Heliconius, Aurivillius, 1882 . . . . . 43, 197
erato, Papilio, Linnaeus, 1758 43
EUDOCIMINAE Bonaparte, 1854 243
Eudocimus Wagler, 1832 243

filamentosus, Callionymus, Valenciennes, 1837 58
flavicornis, Chrysomela, Fabricius, 1787 (Opinion 1270) 22
flavicornis, Chrysomela, Suffrian, 1851 (Opinion 1270) 22
flavipes, Chrysomela, Linnaeus, 1767 (Opinion 1273) 28
foetidus, Scarabaeus, Herbst, 1782 266
formicina, Chirothecia, Taczanowski, 1879 (Opinion 1265) 10
frontalis, Mordella, Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1273) 28
fulgens, Leptoclinum, Milne Edwards, 1841 260
fusca, Chermes, Zetterstedt, 1828 (Opinion 1286) 235
fusca, Psylla, Geoffroy in Fourcroy, 1785 (Opinion 1286) 235
fuscirostris, Curculio, Paykull, 1792 48

galeata, Testudo, Schoepff, 1792 199
GLYPHIPTERIGIDAE Stainton, 1854 253
Glyphipterix Hübner, [1825] 250
GLYPHIPTERYGIDAE Stainton, 1854 251
Glyphipteryx Curtis, 1827 250
Gnamptodon Haliday, 1833 53
Gnaptodon Haliday, 1837 53
Gnathodus Pander, 1856 205
Goera Stephens, 1829 80
GOERIDAE Ulmer, 1903 80
griseus, Hypothenemus, Blackburn, 1885 189
gussoni, Ancylus, O. G. Costa, 1829 159

haematodes, Cicada, Scopoli, 1763 166
Hellichiella Rivosecchi & Cardinali, 1978 83
herbstii, Panopeus, H. Milne Edwards, 1834 (Opinion 1282) 225

incrustans, Diastopora, d'Orbigny, 1850 77
Indodorylaimus Ali & Prabha, 1974 137
inops, Cryphalus, Eichhoff, 1872 189

janitor, Terebratula, Pictet, 1867 267

KINOSTERNIDAE Gray, 1869 199
Kinosternon Spix, 1824 199
kumpani, Brachythyris, Yanischevsky, 1905 105

lactea, Hyla, Laurenti, 1768 122
lactea, Hyla, Daudin, 1803 122
Lampyris Geoffroy, 1762 (Opinion 1273) 28
Laria Schrank, 1802 (Opinion 1283) 228
LARIIDAE Newman, 1832 (Opinion 1283) 228
Laspeyresia R.L., 1817 110
Laspeyresia Hübner [1825] 110
latipes, Atractocera, Meigen, 1804 . . . . . 83, 211
Leptoclinum Milne Edwards, 1841 260
Leptosia Hübner, 1818 259
LEUCASPIDINAE Atkinson, 1886 102
Leucaspis Burmeister, 1835 101
Leucaspis Signoret, 1869 101
leucophaea, Simia, F. Cuvier, 1807 (Opinion 1268) 17
liberiensis, Hippopotamus, Morton, 1849 94
limatula, Acmaea, Carpenter, 1864 (Opinion 1281) 223
limpidus, Centrurus, Karsch, 1879 97
linneella, Phalaena, Clerck, 1759 250
LIPARIDAE Boisduval, 1834 (Opinion 1283) 228
Liparis Ochsenheimer, 1810 (Opinion 1283) 228
listerianum, Leptoclinum, Milne Edwards, 1841 260
longicaudatum, Kinosternon, Spix, 1824 202
longus, Calanus, Lubbock, 1854 (Opinion 1269) 19
Luperus Geoffroy, 1762 (Opinion 1273) 28

Lymantria Hübner, [1819] (Opinion 1283) 227
LYMANTRIIDAE Hampson, [1893] (Opinion 1283) 227
Lyristes Horváth, 1926 163
LYRISTINAE Gomez-Menor, 1957 165

macellaria, Musca, Fabricius, 1775 127
Macrocephalites Zittel, 1884 (Opinion 1275) 34
macrocephalus, Ammonites, Schlotheim, 1813 (Opinion 1275) . . . 34
maculata, Rana, Brocchi, 1877 185
mamillata, Patella, Reeve, 1855 (Opinion 1281) 223
mangiferae, Hypocryphalus, (Stebbing, 1914) 189
marginata, Semblis, Fabricius, 1793 (Opinion 1276) 36
marginata, Semblis, Panzer, 1799 (Opinion 1276) 36
Marthamea Klapálek, 1907 (Opinion 1276) 36
maxima, Phryganea, Scopoli, 1763 (Opinion 1276) 36
Megilla Fabricius, 1805 138
melas, Dermestes, Marsham, 1802 (Opinion 1277) 213
MEROPIDAE Rafinesque, 1815 (Direction 115) 41
METRIDIIDAE Carlgren, 1893 (Opinion 1269) 19
METRIDIIDAE Sars, 1902 (Opinion 1269) 19
METRIDINIDAE Sars, 1902 (Opinion 1269) 19
Metridium Blainville,1824 (Opinion1269) 19
minus [sic], *Cricetodon,* Lartet, 1851 245
monacha, Phalaena, Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1283) 227
murinus, Byrrhus, Fabricius, 1794 114
mutillarius, Clerus, Fabricius, 1775 (Opinion 1273) 28

nesarnack, Delphinus, Lacepède, 1804 274
nibe, Sciaena, Jordan & Thompson, 1911 (Opinion 1272) 26
noctiluca, Cantharis, Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1273) 28

Octolasia Rosa, 1893 257
Octolasion Örley, 1885 254
Octolasion (Incolore) Omodeo, 1952 254
Octolasion (Octodrilus) Omodeo, 1956 254
Octolasion (Purpureum) Omodeo, 1952 254
Octolasium Michaelsen, 1900 254
odorata, Testudo, Latreille, 1801 199
olivaceus, Centrurus, Thorell, 1877 97
Orgyia Ochsenheimer, 1810 (Opinion 1283) 227
ORGYIIDAE Wallengren, 1861 (Opinion 1283) 227
ornatus, Centruroides, Pocock, 1902 97
orni, Cicada, Linnaeus, 1758 166

panope, Cancer, Herbst, 1801 (Opinion 1282) 225
Panopeus H. Milne Edwards, 1834 (Opinion 1282) 225
peckhami, Bellota, Galiano, 1978 (Opinion 1265) 10
Peggichisme Kirkaldy, 1904 (Opinion 1284) 231
Pelomedusa Wagler, 1830 200
PELOMEDUSIDAE Cope, 1868 199
Pelusios Wagler, 1830 198

Pero Herrich-Schäffer, 1855 72
picirostris, Curculio, Fabricius, 1787 45
picirostris, Miccotrogus, Schönherr, 1825 45
picirostris, Tychius, Fabricius, 1787 45
pileus, Terebratula, Bruguière, 1792 267
pilipes, Apis, Fabricius, 1775 139
pilosa,Phryganea, Fabricius, 1775 80
pini, Aspidiotus, Hartig, 1839 101
Platalea Linnaeus, 1758 240
PLATALEINAE Bonaparte, 1838 240
plebeja, Cicada, Scopoli, 1763 163
PLEGADIDAE Mathews, 1913 241
plumigera, Oscinis, Loew, 1860 (Opinion 1264) 8
Polynoe Savigny, 1818 (Opinion 1271) 24
populi, Chrysomela, Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1279) 218
Porcinolus Mulsant & Ray, 1869 114
Psylla Geoffroy, 1762 (Opinion 1286) 235
Ptenidium Erichson, 1845 (Opinion 1277) 212
Ptilium Gyllenhal, 1827 (Opinion 1277) 212
pumilio,Bracon, Nees, 1834 53
pusillum, Scaphidium, Gyllenhal, 1808 (Opinion 1277) 212

Reptomultisparsa d'Orbigny, 1853 77
Rhincodon A. Smith, 1829 (Opinion 1278) 215
RHINCODONTIDAE Müller & Henle, 1841 (Opinion 1278) . . . 215
Rhiniodon A. Smith, 1828 (Opinion 1278) 215
RHOPALOCERINI Reitter, 1911 116
Rhopalocerus W. Redtenbacher, 1842 116
richmondi, Eleutherodactylus, Stejneger, 1904 185
rondanii, Monotoma?, A. Villa & J. B. Villa, 1833 116
rubidus, Byrrhus, Kugelann, 1792 114
rueppelli, Barbus, Boulenger, 1902 (Opinion 1285) 233
rueppellii, Labeo, Pfeffer, 1896 (Opinion 1285) 233
*rufa, Aegialia,*Fabricius, 1792 265
ruficauda, Muscicapa, Swainson, 1838 (Opinion 1267) 15
rufus, Aphodius, Moll, 1782 265
rufus, Scarabaeus, Moll, 1782 265
rufus, Scarabaeus, Fabricius, 1792 265
ryeii, Drymus, Douglas & Scott, 1865 263

sagitta, Callionymus, Pallas, 1770 58
scolopendrina, Polynoe, Savigny, 1822 (Opinion 1271) 24
Scoptes Hübner, [1819] 119, 197
scybalarius, Scarabaeus, Fabricius, 1781 266
scybalarius, Aphodius, Fabricius, 1792 265
senckenbergiana, Oreophryne, Boettger, 1895 (Opinion 1266) . . . 12
senilis, Priapus, Linnaeus, 1761 (Opinion 1269) 19
silvestris, Simia, Schreber, [1800] (Opinion 1268) 17
Spartycerus Motschulsky, 1837 116
Sphaenorhynchus Tschudi, 1838 122
staphylaea, Chrysomela, Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1279) 218

stephensi, Tychius, Schönherr, 1836 45
STERNOTHAERINA Bell, 1825 199
Sternothaerus Bell, 1825 198
Sternothaerus Brown, 1908 199
Sternotherus Gray, 1825 198
striata, Notonecta, Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1274) 32
subexcisum, Simulium, Edwards, 1915 83
subnigra, Testudo, Lacépède, 1788 198
sylvaticus ryeii, Drymus, Douglas & Scott, 1865 263
sylvestris, Simia, Link, 1795 (Opinion 1268) 17

tephra,Dasychira, Hübner, [1809] (Opinion 1283) 227
terrestris var. *lacteus, Lumbricus,* Örley, 1881 254
texanus, Gnathodus, Roundy, 1926 206
Threskiornis Gray, 1842 241
THRESKIORNITHIDAE Richmond, 1917 240
tibialis, Chrysomela, Duftschmid, 1825 (Opinion 1270) 22
tibialis, Chrysomela, Suffrian, 1851 (Opinion 1270) 22
tibicen, Cicada, Linnaeus, 1758 163
Tibicen Berthold, 1827 163
TIBICENINAE Van Duzee, 1916 164
Tibicina Amyot, 1847 163
TIBICININAE Distant, 1905 164
tomentosus, Curculio, Herbst, 1795 50
Tomiopsis Cope, 1893 105
Tomiopsis Benediktova, 1956 105
triangulus, Terebratula, Valenciennes in Lamarck, 1819 267
Trichodes Herbst, 1792 (Opinion 1273) 29
TRICHOSTOMATIDAE Rambur, 1842 80
truncatus, Delphinus, Montagu, 1821 274
truncatus, Tursiops, (Montagu, 1821) 274
typus, Rhiniodon, A. Smith, 1828 (Opinion 1278) 215

undulatus, Byrrhus, Kugelann, 1792 114
unicolor, Cyornis, Blyth, 1843 (Opinion 1267) 15

vernum, Simulium, Macquart, 1826 88
verrucosa, Sphenophryne, Boulenger, 1898 (Opinion 1266) 12
*vesta, Papilio,*Cramer, 1775 43
vitripennis, Perla, Burmeister, 1839 (Opinion 1276) 36

wickeni, Thornenema, Yeates, 1970 137
Williamia Monterosato, 1884 159

CORRIGENDA

Vol. 40, part 4
page 244, line 4

after '*Euphaedra* alone' insert 'in the systematic checklist of Carcasson, 1981, page 166'

Vol. 41, part 1
page 24, line 6

for '*Polynoe scolopendrina* Savigny, 1812' read '*Polynoe scolopendrina* Savigny, 1822'

Vol. 41, part 2
page 110, lines 6 and 7

To read: '*Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825], p. 381 (type species *Tortrix corollana* Hübner, 1823, pl. 45, by subsequent designation by Fernald . . .)'

Vol. 41, part 3
page 159, line 24
and page 160, line 16

for 'ENODONTIDAE' read 'ENDODONTIDAE'

PARTICULARS OF DATES OF PUBLICATION OF THE SEVERAL PARTS IN WHICH THE PRESENT VOLUME WAS PUBLISHED

Part No.	*Contents of Part (pages)*	*Date of Publication*
1	1–66	29 March 1984
2	67–128	29 June 1984
3	129–190	23 August 1984
4	191–288	30 November 1984

INSTRUCTIONS TO BINDER

The present volume should be bound up as follows:
T.P. I–VI, 1–288

Note: The wrappers (covers) of the four parts should be bound in at the end of the volume.

Cricetodon minus [sic] Lartet, 1851 (Mammalia, Rodentia). The Secretary. 245
Glyphipterix Hübner, [1825] (Insecta, Lepidoptera). The Secretary. . . 250
Octolasion Örley, 1885; *Octolasion (Octodrilus)* Omodeo, 1956; *Octolasion (Incolore)* Omodeo, 1952 and *Octolasion (Purpureum)* Omodeo, 1952 (Annelida, Oligochaeta, Lumbricidae). R.W. Sims . 254
Leptosia Hübner, 1818 (Insecta, Lepidoptera). C.F. Cowan 259
Diplosoma MacDonald, 1859; *Leptoclinum fulgens* Milne Edwards, 1841 (Ascidiacea). F.W.E. Rowe 260
Drymus ryeii Douglas and Scott, 1865 (Hemiptera, Lygaeidae). L. Jessop 263
Aphodius rufus Moll, 1782; *Aegialia rufa* Fabricius, 1792 & *Aphodius scybalarius* Fabricius, 1792 (Insecta, Coleoptera), Z. Stebnicka . . 265
PYGOPIDAE (Brachiopoda). F.A. Middlemiss 267
Delphinus truncatus Montagu, 1821; *Delphinus nesarnack* Lacépède, 1804 (Mammalia, Cetacea). D.W.Rice. 274

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature wishes to express its appreciation of the facilities provided by the Trustees of the British Museum (Natural History) for the Secretariat of the Commission.

CONTENTS

Page

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology:
(a) Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 191
(b) Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers in certain cases 191
(c) Receipt of new applications 192
Financial Report for 1983 193
International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, Third Edition . . . 196

Comments

On the proposed conservation of *Capys* Hewitson, 1865. C.F. Cowan . 197
Corrections to the application concerning *Heliconius erato* Aurivillius, 1882. J.R.G. Turner 197
On the application concerning *Sternotherus* Gray, 1825 and *Pelusios* Wagler, 1830. R. Bour and A. Dubois 198
On *Gnathodus* Pander, 1856 and proposal that *Polygnatus bilineatus* Roundy, 1926 be the type species. The Secretary. 205
On CAECILIIDAE in Amphibia and Insecta (Psocoptera). T.E. Moore. 207
On *Adianthus bucatus* Ameghino, 1891. R.M. Schoch 208
On *Atractocera latipes* Meigen, 1804. D.C. Curry; T.K. Crosby. . . . 211

Opinions

Opinion 1277. *Ptilium* Gyllenhal, 1827 and *Ptenidium* Erichson, 1845 (Insecta, Coleoptera). 212
Opinion 1278. *Rhincodon* A. Smith, 1829 (Pisces) 215
Opinion 1279. *Chrysolina* Motschulsky, 1860 (Insecta, Coleoptera) . . 218
Opinion 1280. Rafinesque, C.S., 1822, 'On the turtles of the United States': suppressed 221
Opinion 1281. *Acmaea limatula* Carpenter, 1864 (Mollusca, Gastropoda) 223
Opinion 1282. *Panopeus* H. Milne Edwards, 1834 (Crustacea, Decapoda) 225
Opinion 1283. LYMANTRIIDAE Hampson, [1893] precedence over ORGYIIDAE Wallengren 1861, and DASYCHIRIDAE Packard, 1864 (Insecta, Lepidoptera) 227
Opinion 1284. *Peggischisme* Kirkaldy, 1904 (Hemiptera, Heteroptera). . 231
Opinion 1285. *Barbus altianalis* Boulenger, 1900 and *Barbus rueppelli* Boulenger, 1902 (Pisces, Cyprinidae) 233
Opinion 1286. *Chermes fusca* Zetterstedt, 1828 (Insecta, Homoptera). . 235
Opinion 1287. *Sesia andrenaeformis* Laspeyres, 1801 (Insecta, Lepidoptera) 238

New and revived cases

THRESKIORNITHAE Richmond, 1917 and PLATALEINAE Bonaparte, 1838 (Aves) E. Eisenmann (deceased), E. Mayr & K. C. Parkes 240

Continued on Inside Back Cover

Printed in Great Britain by Henry Ling Ltd., at the Dorset Press, Dorchester, Dorset